			2
1		INDEX	
2	SPEAKER		PAGE
3	Tracy Smetana		4
4	Barry Simonson		15
5	Larry Hartman		19
6	Bob Merritt		32
7	Larry Hartman		39
8	Bill Behr		40
9	Bob Merritt		40
10	Richard Smith		40
11	Dewane Morgan		49
12	John Hitchcock		51
13	Barry Babcock		52
14	Ken Duncanson		58
15	Lowell Schellack		66
16	John Gasele		66
17	Barry Simonson		68
18	Mark Curwin		70
19	Larry Hartman		71
20	Mark Curwin		73
21	Mary Adams		77
22	Maurice Spangler		84
23	Barry Simonson		85
24	Sharon Natzel		86
25	Larry Hartman		91

		;	3
1	Frank Bibeau	91	
2	Peter Erlinder	95	
3	Thomas Ferrarell	99	
4	Larry Hartman	102	
5	Thomas Ferrarell	102	
6	Larry Hartman	104	
7	Jasmine Larson	106	
8	Michael Swan	108	
9	Dawn Goodwin	112	
10	Janell Saunders	115	
11	Gwe Gasco	117	
12	Winona LaDuke	118	
13	Mary Adams	123	
14	Marty Cobenais	125	
15	Willis Mattison	130	
16	Michael Dahl	134	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1

2

3

4

6

5

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

18

17

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Good morning, If you could please find a seat we'll get

everyone. started in a couple minutes. Thank you.

Good morning, everyone, and thank you very much for coming. I'm Tracy Smetana with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission.

UNIDENTIFIED: We can't hear you.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Is that better?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Excellent. So we'11 try that again.

Good morning and thank you for coming. I'm Tracy Smetana with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission and we are here for the public information meeting for the proposed Sandpiper Pipeline route.

A brief agenda of what we'll be going over this morning. We'll start off with the introduction. We'll move into some information about the roles of various agencies and the process. We'll ask the company to provide some information about their proposed project. We'll ask the Department of Commerce to talk about the environmental analysis process. And then finally we'll open it up for the main event today, and that

is your comments and questions.

So I always like to start out with a little introduction about who is the Public Utilities Commission, because I suspect that many folks haven't had any experience with us in the past and don't really know who we are.

We are a state agency, we regulate permitting for power plants, transmission lines, local and in-state long-distance telephone companies. We also deal with rates and services for investor-owned electric and natural gas utility companies.

We have five Commissioners that are appointed by the governor. And they serve staggered terms, so they're not all -- we don't get a whole new batch every time we get a new governor. So we have some that are appointed by our current governor and some appointed by governors past. It is full-time employment for our Commissioners so they're there 40 hours a week just like the rest of us. And we have about 50 staff that provide assistance with the regulating process.

So a little bit more about who's who as we work through this pipeline proposal. There's some various terms and various folks that play a

part that you might interact with or hear about if you're following this project.

So the first is the applicant. That's the term that we use for the company asking for the certificate of need and the pipeline route permit. So in this case it's North Dakota Pipeline Company.

The Department of Commerce is another state agency that plays a role in the Commission's process. And there's sort of two different arms of Commerce that play a part here.

The first is the Energy Environmental Review and Analysis group. You might see that abbreviated as EERA. They are, as I said, a state agency and they'll conduct the comparative environmental analysis and Mr. Hartman is here today to talk with you about that.

The other part of Commerce that plays a part here is the Energy Regulation and Planning group. They represent the public interest when utilities ask to change their rates, services, facilities and so on. So they do more of the economic analysis.

Later on in the process we will ask the Office of Administrative Hearings to get involved as well. They're another state agency, they're

independent of the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Commerce. And they will assign an administrative law judge, which you might see abbreviated as ALJ, to this case. His job will be to hold hearings, both public hearings and more formal evidentiary hearings in the process, analyze all of the facts in the record, ultimately write a report for the Public Utilities Commission, including recommendations about this project.

And at the Public Utilities Commission there's two different folks that you may interact with. The first is me, I'm the public advisor. My job is to help you participate in the process, help you understand where to get information, how to get information, how to submit comments, when to submit comments. I'm a neutral party, I'm not here to advocate on anyone's behalf. I don't give legal advice. I'm not an advocate.

The other part of the team at the Commission is our energy facility planner. Their job is to assist in building the record on the technical side of things. So certainly questions of a technical nature would be addressed best by this person. But, again, Commission staff, we're all neutral, we're not giving legal advice, we're not

advocating for any one party or position.

So in this particular case, the pipeline project that the company has proposed does require a certificate of need from the state of Minnesota. That's because it's a large energy facility, it transports petroleum. It's a pipeline with a diameter of six inches or more with more than 50 miles in Minnesota. And there are some statutes and rules that provide guidance on how the Commission is to review that and I've included that information here for those of you who are looking for some really good bedtime reading.

This project also requires a route permit from the State of Minnesota before it could be built. That's because it has a diameter of six inches or more and transports hazardous liquids and, again, I've included the statute and rule citations for your information.

So how does the Public Utilities

Commission decide on a route? First of all, the

Commission decides on the question of need. Is the

project needed. The second piece is if it's needed

where is it going to go. And so according to the

statutes and rules, these are the factors the

Commission has to consider when making the route

decision. To look at things like human settlement
and natural environment, archaeological and historic
resources, the economy, pipeline costs and
accessibility, use of existing rights-of-way,
cumulative effects of future construction, and also
want to make sure the project is in compliance with
local, state and federal regulations.

Now, what the rules and statues don't do is prioritize this list. So some folks might say at whatever cost avoid human settlement. Other folks might say at whatever cost, you know, protect the natural environment. Sometimes those two things can be at odds, so the Commissioners have to decide which way we're going to go.

So if you like pictures, this is a chart of how the process works. We're going to talk about the certificate of need process first because, as I said, first the question is is the project needed, right. And so you can see application accepted is the first box. And application accepted just means that it meets the requirements for further review. I know sometimes that term is confusing for people, they say it's accepted, well, what are we doing here, isn't it already decided? No, it's not. Accepted just means that all the information

necessary to move on to the further review has been received.

Now, this is the pipeline route permit process. And you can see it looks pretty similar, with the added bonus of the environmental review over here. And so Mr. Hartman will be talking a little bit more about submitting alternative routes and what the environmental review process looks like for this type of project.

You can also see we're very early on in the process. We are in box number two of the public information meetings. And so there are a number of other steps that need to be taken before we get down to that bottom box, the decision.

Along the way there are some opportunities for folks to get involved. As I mentioned earlier, an administrative law judge will be involved in this process and will schedule public hearings back up in this area down the road. Those dates have not yet been set, but if you're on the project mailing list or you subscribe on the e-mail list, you'll receive information on that.

If you're a list person instead of a picture person, this one is for you. So you can see, again, here we are, the public information

meetings in March. And keep in mind, this is an estimated timeline. As I said, these dates are not carved in stone yet. The judge will establish most of the schedule for us and so we haven't gotten to that stage yet. But at this point we are anticipating decisions on the route and the need in January 2015.

And so this is just an example of when we have what we call an open comment period. We will send a notice, and so to some of you who have been receiving information about this project already, this might look familiar. This is one that has already passed, but I wanted to use it as an example so that I could point out some elements that you want to look for if you receive one of these and you want to make some comments.

So the first thing to note is what we call the docket number. That's how we track everything. Just like if you're an employer you might have an employee I.D. and that's how you track your employees, we track everything we do by this docket number. So that's sort of the magic number you want to know if you're communicating with our office about this project, okay. And that will always be listed on the notice.

The other thing you'll want to pay attention to is the comment period, when does it open and close. So if the comment comes in after the period has closed, we've already moved on to something else. So you want to make certain that your comments are submitted during the time frame that the comment period's open.

And the last piece you want to pay attention to is the topics open for comment. Now, if you think back to that flow chart, as we worked through it there's various questions that we're asking along the way. And at different points in time we're going to want answers to different types of questions.

So you can see this particular notice from back in November, we were concerned with is the application complete, have they submitted everything they need so we can move along to the next step in the process. And so those decisions have been made. If somebody submits answers to these questions now, they really can't be considered in that part of the decision-making process.

So, again, one of the issues that we'll be discussing today, Mr. Hartman will provide some more detail around this, is submitting alternative

routes and route segments. The company has submitted what they believe is the best route for this project, but we do have a process where folks, anyone, someone here sitting in the room, another state agency, anyone who has an interest can submit an alternative route or a route segment. And there's some details about what information you have to include in order to do that. And ultimately the Public Utilities Commission will decide which of those routes move forward for further study and ultimately will be considered as options in this process.

Now, if you're looking to get information about the project after today there's a few different ways you can do that. We have all of our documents that are submitted in this project in what we call our eDocket system. And any information that is public information in that eDocket system, you can go online and take a look at it any time you like. And these are the instructions for how to do that. And, again, you note the docket number is sort of the key to finding that information.

We also maintain a project mailing list where you would receive notices about meetings like today, the public hearings, other sort of points of

interest along the way. And we have orange cards here at the table when you came in if you'd like to sign up for that.

Now, I know that there are many folks that would like to receive a copy of everything that comes in and so we do have an e-mail subscription feature, and I suspect many of you are already subscribing to this. If you already subscribed, you don't also need to be on the orange card mailing list, you'd be getting duplicates of information. So these are the steps to subscribe to receive a notice when anything new comes into this docket.

Now, for some folks that's information overload. If you don't like e-mail it's probably not the best choice for you. But the good news is is if you subscribe and you decide it's too much you can always unsubscribe as well. And this is just a screenshot of what that subscribe page looks like when you get to it. 'Cause I know some people have said it's not super user-friendly, so I thought I'd give you a little help on that.

And, again, at the Public Utilities

Commission there are two folks that you might

interact with. The first is me, I'm the public

advisor, Tracy Smetana. My contact information is

there. My counterpart, Mr. Scott Ek, is not here today, but he is the energy facilities planner working on this particular project.

And with that I'm going to turn it over to the applicant.

MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Okay. Good day to everybody. I hope everyone can hear me. I am Barry Simonson and I work for Enbridge. I am the manager of engineering and construction for the Sandpiper Pipeline project.

The scope of work. Sandpiper is a planned 616-mile pipeline project that begins in the western portion of North Dakota around Tioga, traverses easterly through North Dakota and on into Clearbrook, Minnesota. From Clearbrook our preferred route is to go south down through Park Rapids where we are today, just south of here, and then east all the way to Superior, Wisconsin.

From the start point in North Dakota, the pipeline diameter is 24 inches. It's a .375-inch wall thickness, predominantly, and it traverses easterly to Clearbrook, the 24-inch the entire way, which is around 375 miles.

Once we get to the border of North Dakota to Clearbrook, there's 75 miles of 24-inch that's

part of that 375 miles. Now, once we get to Clearbrook there will be a new terminal in Clearbrook and there will be a change in diameter to 30-inch-diameter pipeline that will head south and then east as described earlier. That pipeline will have a predominant wall thickness of 0.469-inch wall thickness, close to a half-inch wall.

In terms of construction. We're looking to -- depending upon permits that are required, we're looking to construct in the winter of 2014, '15, as well as a predominant 2015 construction season with an in-service date of Q1 of 2016.

In terms of what Tracy mentioned previously, in terms of what the PUC looks at with the routing. For the entire route through Minnesota, which is about 275 miles, we're looking at about a 75 percent collocation. What I mean by that is we're either collocated with an Enbridge asset pipeline or another utility company.

The total budget for this project is around 2.6 billion, so it's a big undertaking by the company.

Now we get into the more of the specific routing in the state of Minnesota. From the border of North Dakota-Minnesota to Clearbrook, we are

looking to collocate with our existing line 81, which starts in North Dakota and heads to Clearbrook.

From Clearbrook to Park Rapids we are, and especially in Hubbard County, which is important, we're 99 percent collocated with an existing utility, which is a pipeline, a crude oil pipeline company owned by MinnCan, Minnesota Pipeline Company.

From Park Rapids heading east we are trying to collocate with an existing power line, a DC power line that heads east, and then at a point in Aitkin County we're heading east and then connecting back up with existing utilities on to the Minnesota-Wisconsin border.

Now, what are the project benefits? You can't see the whole topic here, but this is all North Dakota crude oil. This is not tar sand oil, it's crude oil that starts at the Bakken formation in North Dakota. So it's offsetting imports from countries that are unstable or unfriendly to U.S. interests, which helps the nation's energy independence.

During construction, we're looking at various work with contractors, so there is a

potential for 1500 jobs that are created, that will happen between 2014 and '15 and '16. And we look to see that there will be local resources utilized within this county as well as other counties in the state of Minnesota. Whether it's local jobs, whether it's resources, gravel, trucking, contract resources, accommodations, gas, food, we look to see that happening.

And in terms of taxes. We're looking at in the past Enbridge has paid \$34 million in Minnesota property taxes, and we expect to pay an additional 25 million annually in Minnesota after Sandpiper goes into service. And specifically Hubbard County, we're looking at around \$5 million a year when that comes in service in Q1 of 2016.

Now, what are our goals? Safety, integrity, and respect. Safety being number one.

And that goes with how we design our pipeline, how we construct it, and how we operate the pipeline.

And we invest in safe technology, we work with other industries because the safety of our pipeline is key. And we strive for fair and equitable stakeholders.

Now, I see that we have a larger crowd than the past three events, so I hope we'll have

some productive questions that we can answer that are specific to Sandpiper.

Thank you for attending and I'll hand it over to Mr. Hartman.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you. Is it working now?

Before I start, I'd like to make a few announcements before we proceed today. To my right we have a court reporter. Janet will be compiling an oral record. She will be at all the meetings and was at all the meetings last week.

Once the meetings are completed, we'll receive an oral -- or a document from Janet which we'll post on our website and eDockets. So it will be a transcription, basically, of what's gone on at all the public information meetings for this project. Besides being on eDockets, it will also be posted on our website. So if you are attending other meetings, that's fine. If you'd like to find out what's gone on at the other meetings and are unable to attend, you'll be able to read the summary that Janet has prepared, which will be available probably sometime in early April, I would imagine.

This is just basically the schedule we've kept so far. Regarding the meetings, we have one

tonight in Pine River then we finish up the meetings in McGregor and Carlton.

As was mentioned earlier, the pipeline permitting process was established by the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board in 1998 -- or, excuse me, 1988, when the rules were adopted. When the rules were adopted the board also approved the rules as an alternative form of environmental review. And I'll explain that in a little bit more detail later on.

As part of that process we have a series of scoping or public information meetings. There's two rounds of that, actually, the second one precedes the public hearings.

The first round of public information meetings is basically to present information about the project, the permitting process, and it's also an opportunity for us to explain to you how the permitting process works. And it's also an opportunity for us to hear what your comments and concerns are.

Again, as Tracy indicated, comments are due by April 4th. That's 4:30, it's a Friday.

That's also for route proposals too. They can be submitted by e-mail, by fax. You can also go to our

website and you can submit comments electronically through our website. And that's part of the -- it's listed in the PowerPoint presentation and I'll talk a little bit more about that later on also.

It's also an opportunity for you to propose additional routes and/or route segments, which would be an alternative to what Enbridge has proposed. You can also suggest specific impacts to be evaluated in the comparative environmental assessment also. And we did receive a number of comments about a number of different issues last week also. Again, those will be summarized and posted also.

A person desiring that a particular route be considered needs to submit that to me and that needs to be done by April 4th also. If you want to submit something, it helps to put it on a map or a photo, a USGS map, a plat book map, a highway map, and just basically try to identify it. If you fax it to me I want to caution you on one thing. There are maps in the back of the room that Casey Nelson will pull for you. Casey is also with the Minnesota Department of Commerce staff, EERA staff. Casey is right over there, waving her hand. So if you want a detailed aerial photo or a USGS map they should be

available from her in the back of the room.

If you decide to fax it in to me, please remember that it's a color map, if you fax it to me with a route on it it's going to show up as black and white and I probably won't be able to read it, which means I'll need to contact you and ask you to resubmit it in a format that I can work with.

Again, what we do is, after that deadline comes in, and I've had a number of suggestions so far, I've received numerous e-mails with opinions, comments, suggestions also. Once it goes in, we'll go through and we'll evaluate all the route proposals. And I'll try to go through that rather briefly here so we can get to your questions.

We should go to the next slide. This is an example of a transmission line route that is in the southwest metro area of the Twin Cities. The line in kind of purple, I guess, reddish, was what the applicant proposed. Through the alternate route permitting process -- not the alternate route permitting, but the alternative route proposal process, two other alternatives were identified. This is similar to the type of information we are looking for. It doesn't have to be as detailed as that, the more detailed it is the more helpful it is

also.

We have the guidance document in the back of the room that gives you some guidance in how to make a proposal. And on the back of that guidance document we've also listed the criteria that the Commission reviews in making a decision as to whether to consider a route and carry it forward to the public hearing.

Between now and April 4th, if you have any questions on how to make a route proposal, please contact me or Casey at your convenience.

I'd encourage you, if you're a landowner, to work with your neighbors, if you'd like to work together to make a proposal also.

This is just kind of an example. If you would like to submit something in writing that's important reasons, I won't go through it and read it, it's in the PowerPoint, but just give us some sound reasons why you think it's a viable proposal. If we go through and we do an evaluation, we go through all the route and route segments received, if we feel it's lacking a little bit of information we might contact you to request additional information. Again, a lot of it might be based on just what your opinion is.

Once those are -- once they come in, we'll go through and evaluate them. We'll compile them, I don't know in what way. We'll then present them to the Public Utilities Commission and then the Commission will make the ultimate determination as to which route or route segments go forward for the contested case hearing.

In previous projects, we have had a number of alternatives. I don't know that any were rejected. On one project we did have a proposal which was fairly significant which was rejected because it went through the core of the metropolitan area and there just physically was no room to install another pipeline.

If there are issues or impacts you'd like to see considered in the environmental analysis, we also have comment sheets back there you can fill out. I'd encourage you to take sheets or multiple copies of the sheet. You can put your comments on those, fold it, tape it shut, and it's postage prepaid and has my address on it so it will come to me. You can also submit those electronically also.

Types of issues. Methods of soil separation. And, again, this is not meant to be comprehensive or inclusive, it's just examples. So

if you're concerned, if you're a farmer and you're concerned about impact on soils, there are methods of soil separation. This is outlined in the appendix, one of the appendices in the application submitted by Enbridge for the agricultural mitigation plan.

Drain tile repair, soil compaction, organic farmlands, irrigation systems, crop losses, proposed land use plans, residential, industrial, natural resource features, rural water systems, roads. Stream and river crossings, wetlands, clearing of vegetation, wildlife, cultural resources.

The Commission then, once they receive our package, staff over there will go through that, they may make additions or modifications to it.

Then it'll be scheduled for a Commission meeting.

The Commission would then determine what routes would be considered at the ALJ hearing to be held probably sometime this fall.

After the Commission makes that determination, we would then begin preparation of the comparative environmental analysis to address the issues raised at the public information meetings.

I'll take questions when I'm done, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you slow down a little

bit so we can read?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Oh, sure. It's in the PowerPoint presentation also. I was just trying to be brief so we can get to the questions.

So that would start, we'll engage a third-party consultant to assist us with that. And basically it's a written document that will evaluate the route proposals and especially impacts and mitigation procedures or mitigation requirements for the project to minimize impacts.

Again, as Tracy mentioned, the hearings will be presided over by an administrative law judge. And as long as I'm mentioning that, there will be a prehearing conference next Monday, March 17th, in the PUC's large hearing room in St. Paul.

The hearings will be this fall, once the comparative analysis is available, to present testimony and evidence in the record that will be used by the administrative law judge in preparation of his report.

There are also a number of state agencies that have downstream jurisdiction for large energy

projects, and they will probably be participating in this process also. The Department of Commerce, which is where I work, I'm on the EERA staff. DNR would be participating. They issue licenses for crossing of public lands and waters. And I believe there's a representative from DNR here today, Nathan Kessler. I don't know if you're here, Nathan?

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency also issues permits for stormwater runoff, water discharge permits. Minnesota Department of Health, there's setbacks from water wells for pipelines. The Minnesota Department of Agriculture is responsible for issuance or preparation or authorization of the agricultural mitigation and protection plan. And Bob Patton, who is with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, is back over there. And Bob will be at the meetings tonight and tomorrow also.

And Minnesota Department of

Transportation issues permits for road crossings,
state highways. Counties, townships also have
responsibility for issuing permits for
infrastructure also, which includes ditches.

The Minnesota Department of -- excuse me.

The Minnesota Department of Public Safety has an Office of Pipeline Safety and they are an authorized agent of the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety division, and they are an authorized inspector for both interstate and intrastate pipelines, both liquid as well as product lines also.

By statute, the Commission is prohibited from making safety-related decisions; however, some issues are perhaps environmental as well as safety and we try to kind of be careful about that.

This is our website where I work. And on our website you'll find basically the primary documents we produce. We have the applicant's application reposted, as of February 15th, I believe. And they've updated their application. We've broken that application down by the table of contents and we've also included all the route permits or all the maps in their application, they're broken down by county, by township, and by milepost with file sizes. For those of you who might have limited Internet access, some of the file sizes are typically between four and eight megabytes just so you have an idea.

Again, if you need copies of maps and you

don't get them back here today, I'd encourage you to
go to our website. Typically they're eight by 17,
you can probably reduce the size, but those maps are
there.

Also, the application has been

Also, the application has been distributed on CDs to a number of the libraries, all township clerks, county auditors and others also have that and will make it available. I believe -- are there applications back there on CD-ROMs?

MR. JOHN GASELE: Some are.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Some are, okay. They are also available from the company on request.

Again, if you want to submit comments, you can do it by mail. Again, we've got comment sheets back there, e-mail, fax, vis-a-vis our website. That is also in the PowerPoint. I have business cards back there at the table. If you are busy during the day and can't get ahold of me, I do have a cell phone number on there. Please feel free to contact me at your convenience if you do have any questions.

And with that, I will wrap up my presentation. And we'd probably like to start with comments.

Now, again, as I've mentioned, Janet is

here to make an oral summary of what's being said, so please, when you come up, please sit at the chair, speak into the microphone, spell your name for the court reporter, and try to speak slowly and clearly so everyone else can hear you.

I might just go on and mention a few other things also. Tracy had mentioned there are two dockets. 13-473 is the certificate of need docket. Some of the comments that have come in that might be meant for me have been going to that docket. I get copied on that docket also. 13-474 is the primary docket number for the route permit proceedings. That's the docket number that I pay the most attention to.

There are also some other things regarding pipelines that I'd like to mention.

Minnesota, I don't know when, or I don't recall the year right offhand, but the federal regulations for the part of the pipelines have a minimum burial depth of 36 inches from the top of the pipe to the top of the ground. In Minnesota we have our own law which requires a depth of 54 inches unless it's waived by the landowner. That applies to all farmland, it applies to drainage ditches and all roads also. If there are any ditching plans, future

plans, that's always helpful to convey information like that because the pipeline will go below the ditch line and future ditch lines also.

The Federal Office of Pipeline Safety has the basic overall jurisdiction. Their authorization is in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, parts 195 for liquid lines, 192 for gas lines.

Again, as I mentioned, there will be a prehearing conference March 17th that will be convened by the ALJ. We have had a number of parties intervene. I checked this morning, we had a couple other parties who have intervened since yesterday. I think Honor the Earth is one, and I don't remember the name of the other one at this point in time.

With that, I'll conclude my initial remarks and we'd like to open up to questions. There was a speaker card you could fill out back there. What I'd like to do is call on some of those people first who might have other commitments, at least one person does that I'm aware of. And other than that you can raise your hands. For those groups who have been kind of coming to all the meetings, I'd like to ask you to defer your questions until people who haven't participated

1 before have an opportunity to ask their questions. So, with that, what I'd like to do is 2 call on the first person I have a card for and that 3 4 would be Bob Merritt. 5 UNIDENTIFIED: Where do I get a card? MR. LARRY HARTMAN: They're back by the 6 desk. 7 MR. BOB MERRITT: Good morning. 8 My name is Bob Merritt. 9 10 I have provided you with three documents 11 that are basically the same, are all the same except 12 for the one does not have my testimony that I intend 13 to read to you. 14 The reason I provided you with that 15 information is that there are some figures that I 16 would be referring to during my testimony and I 17 would like to have you review those while I talk so 18 you understand what I'm saying. 19 UNIDENTIFIED: We can't hear you. 20 MR. BOB MERRITT: Perhaps it's easier if 21 I hold onto it. 22 I have a bachelor's degree in geology and 23 a master's degree in hydrology. I'm a licensed 24 Minnesota Professional Geologist. I worked for the

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources for 32 and

25

a half years as an area hydrologist. A part of that area is exactly this particular area that we're talking about today at the hearing in Park Rapids.

First I want to identify a problem that I encountered in a primary review of this project. As a retired person I wanted to have some input in this process. I requested the geographic information systems or GIS layers that shows the proposed pipeline alignment. I was denied that information based upon the fact that Enbridge has identified that as work product information that is exempt from the Freedom of Information Act. Yet all existing pipelines now are still identified in paper and digital form on USGS maps as Minnesota county maps.

Additionally, with GPS units available today, it's quite easy to map public utilities such as pipelines and processing plants. To withhold crucial information from my review hampered my analysis. I'm still unsure of the exact alignment and had to approximate it on the maps.

To me, it is ludicrous for a company to invoke protection by exemption of the Freedom of Information Act under these circumstances. They are withholding crucial information for review with no reason other than to hamper the review by the

public.

There are three major studies of the glacial outwash plain comprising the Straight River basin and the surrounding area. They are Helgesen, 1977, Groundwater Appraisal of the Pineland Sands Area, Central Minnesota, by USGS Water-Resources Investigation Report. Stark, Armstrong and Zwilling, 1994, Stream-Aquifer Interactions in the Straight River Area, Becker and Hubbard Counties, USGS Water-Resources Investigation Report 94-4009. And the reports by the Department of Natural Resources authored by Greg Kruse and J. Frischman in 2002, Surface Water and Groundwater Interaction and Thermal Changes in the Straight River in North Central Minnesota.

I was the main DNR person who identified the initial concerns leading to the Stark study. I participated in both Stark's and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources' investigation. It was my prime responsibility as the local hydrologist and to provide the local participation.

Helgesen and Stark described the geology of this area. Basically it is the intersection of at least three glacial lobes that ended in the area. That is shown in the Figure 3 by Stark, which is

included in your packet. Glacial outwash is the result of glacial materials running off during glacial melting and retreat, forming sand and gravel fans interspaced with lake clay materials formed when lakes existed within the area.

The outcome is a series of three primary aquifers, which are shown as generalized format in Stark's Figure 2. Stark's figure is generalized and does not entirely represent the aquifer configurations. The top aquifer is surficial and open to the atmosphere. The two lower aquifers are separated by clayey layers, but the layers are thin and aquifers interfinger causing interchange between them. There is substantial evidence that the aquifers are hydraulically connected and water moves both upward and downward.

Because of their high degree of permeability, allowing rapid infiltration and movement, glacial outwash aquifers are some of the geologic environments most susceptible to contamination.

Helgesen estimated the aquifer groundwater hydraulic conductivities, a measure of the groundwater movement, between 320 and 630 feet per day. This is a rapid degree of groundwater

movement. Stark postulated that this area's groundwater movement is even greater than other similar aquifers within the state.

The area is covered with high-capacity irrigation wells, which cause cones of depression, altering flow paths and moving substantial water towards the systems. I have shown in my map the GIS 2010 aerial photo, it identifies the numerous irrigation wells through which the pipeline, I am led to believe, is going. I also have included in that map locations of other wells that can be impacted. And there are a number of aquifer -- a number of wells within this aquifer, in all three of them.

Helgesen and Stark published

potentiometric ^ ? Word seems to refer to electrical

voltage maps of the surficial aquifer, Helgesen

Figure 7 and Stark's Figure 15. I supplemented

Helgesen's map and interpreted Stark's map to

identify flow paths. They are in red arrows. I

would appreciate it if you would take a look at

those. They are particularly important for the very

reason it shows the directions of flows of the

groundwater movement from where a leak may occur

from that pipeline. It shows that there is rapid ---

or there is movement towards a designated trout stream, probably the premier trout stream within northwestern Minnesota, and it flows to Park Rapids, it flows to the potato plant, and it flows and can impact every well down gradient of this pipeline.

Water rapidly flows from the aquifer to the Straight River. The river deems at least half its flow from this aquifer. The hills to the north in the sand plain, which is called the Itasca Lobe end moraine. And the groundwater moraine and the ground moraine provides about 25 percent of the recharge to this aquifer. This is likely even a greater percentage closer to the Itasca moraine end in the Park Rapids area. A pipeline leak in the Itasca end moraine will end up flowing to Park Rapids.

Leaks within the aquifer with either -will either end up in the Straight River or move
towards Park Rapids and the potato plant locations.
High-capacity pumping of these facilities along with
irrigation wells near and down gradient of a spill
or leakage has significant potential to incorporate
petroleum products into the aquifer. Irrigation of
the contaminated water will result in agricultural
field contamination.

A leak along any portion of the pipeline from the Itasca moraine north to the outwash sand plain through the entire plain has the potential to rapidly and permanently contaminate the aquifer.

The surficial aquifer has the highest potential, but as noted earlier, all of the aquifers are interconnected. As a result, contamination of all the aquifers is a possibility. Once petroleum attaches to the sand and gravel grains, it is virtually impossible to remove the product. Each time rain, snowmelt or irrigation infiltrates through the aquifer, petroleum will be mobilized, causing ongoing contamination.

The surficial aquifer is used for irrigation and water supply. Surrounding wells already have high nitrates from the irrigation because of the high infiltration rates. Though nitrate application through the irrigation systems has been greatly improved by application only during the time plants require the nutrient, a Department of Agriculture study showed that approximately 60 percent of the nitrate was lost because of rapid infiltration. Once the nitrate passes through the root zone, it ends up in the surficial aquifer.

Because of nitrate contamination, Park

Rapids will have to replace their water supply wells. Osage had to do it in the past. Perham has had similar problems; it is the same geological conditions. Petroleum will even be more damaging, causing loss of water supplies to individuals and communities down gradient of the leak. Straight River, the most important trout stream in northwestern Minnesota, could also be severely impacted due to petroleum contamination.

I urge you to reconsider this alignment and restrict pipelines within highly sensitive geologic areas such as this. At the very least, I urge delay of your decision to allow further analysis with accurate data, freely supplied by Enbridge, rather than being held in tight protection.

Part of the fact that I have included information that is contained in the reports that I referenced at first is to back up the support -- to support my testimony to you today.

I appreciate it and thank you very much.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I should have announced earlier, and it's my fault, there's also a representative here from the Corps of Engineers today, Bob Behr (phonetic). Bob, I don't know --

1 MR. BILL BEHR: Bill. 2 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Or Bill, I'm sorry. He's right back there. And I had also mentioned we 3 4 have a court reporter here, she needs a break after 5 an hour and a half, so around 12:30 we'll take a short break. 7 MR. BOB MERRITT: If you can give me your e-mail address, I'll be more than --8 UNIDENTIFIED: We can't hear. 9 10 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: He wants my e-mail 11 address, and it's on the business card you can pick 12 up in the back, and it's on the last slide in the 13 PowerPoint also. Thank you. 14 The next card I have is for Richard 15 Smith. 16 MR. RICHARD SMITH: My name is Richard 17 Smith. Hopefully you don't have a problem spelling 18 that one. 19 Mr. Hartman and Tracy, and the folks at 20 Enbridge, thank you for setting up this chance to --21 is the mic on? MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Take the mic out of 22 23 the stand. 24 Hold onto it. UNIDENTIFIED: 25 MR. RICHARD SMITH: How is this?

0ne

1

UNIDENTIFIED: Better.

2

MR. RICHARD SMITH: Sorry about that.

I'm here today for a couple reasons.

3

is to voice my objections to this particular

5

proposed route of this pipeline, and the other is to

There's a number of folks in the

6

stand up for the people that aren't currently here.

7

8 community that feel that a good number of people

9

that live in Hubbard County who are gone at this

10

time of year are not being fairly represented. And

11

we have been asking those folks and folks that are

12

still here and organizations to write or e-mail the

13

PUC to ask for an extension of the public comment

14

period into August 1st.

15

Primarily we're doing that because,

16

although the Enbridge folks have been planning this for years, a lot of the news that's coming out about

17

the project is reasonably recent. And it's a huge

1819

project, there's a lot of information for lay people

20

to learn and digest and find expert opinion about it

21

and consider the project.

22

week we found out that the Enbridge company wants to

And when I say that, I mean even last

23

wook we round out that the End rage company wanted

24

corridor, it kind of follows Highway 2. And part of

revamp their line 3, which is in the northern

25

that revamp project may mean that they will reroutea section alongside the Sandpiper Pipeline route.

So we think because of some of these late news announcements that people need more time to consider the project. The public, our lands, our waters, and our livelihoods can be greatly affected by this and we think we need a little bit more time.

I'm not -- I will say, I have family that live out in the Bakken and they do have a well on their farmland so I'm not against pipelines per se. But I do have some very serious concerns about this particular pipeline and the route.

Hubbard County is famous for a couple things. Really one is our waters. We are the headwaters for the Mississippi River, one of the world's greatest rivers. And within 25 miles of Park Rapids there are over 400 lakes, some are the clearest and cleanest in the state. That means tourism. Tourism brings in about \$30 million annually and supports around 5,300 jobs in this area.

Secondly, and maybe not too many people know this, but one of the other things we're famous for is potatoes. Our farmers grow some of the best potatoes in the world. They're so good that

McDonald's wants them in their french fries. That also means jobs.

But the community's largest employer is
Lamb Weston/RDO, a potato processing plant outside
of town. And they have about 500 employees and
annual revenues approaching \$500 million. What
grows those potatoes? What grows those potatoes are
the sandy soils that we have in the Straight River
aquifer. Every year this community pumps out about
eight billion gallons of water to grow those
potatoes and also provide drinking water to Park
Rapids. And as Bob Merritt mentioned, that aquifer
also supplies great water to the Straight River, one
of the state's best brown trout streams.

So I'm actually shocked that our politicians and bureaucrats are even considering this area as a viable location to split with an oil pipeline or possibly two pipelines. Especially a pipeline built by a company that has kind of a dubious spill record recently, within the last four or five years. That our bureaucrats and politicians would weigh this as a benefit, just a few short months of construction dollars, against the long-term environmental and economic health of this community and the county is short-term thinking at

best.

I would also think that the fact that they're considering putting a pipeline through some of Minnesota's best waters without demanding a comprehensive environmental impact statement by the proper state and federal agencies responsible for land, waters and wildlife is a joke.

I'd like to -- I just brought a little prop up here so people can have an idea of what's going to happen. This is approximately the size of the pipeline that's going into our county. This is 32 inches, so I'll give Enbridge a credit, you know, their line is going to be slightly smaller than this. So, now, imagine boring a hole underneath the Mississippi River large enough to hold this?

Now, I don't know if everybody can see it, but in the center I put a little black dot. It's about a quarter inch, maybe, in size. Why I put that dot there, there's a farmer out in North Dakota who last fall was walking in his wheat field and discovered an oil leak. That was 865,000 gallons of oil dumped onto his wheat field that's about the size of seven football fields. Now, that pipeline was only nine inches in diameter, it might have been six. His name is Steve Jensen. And, by

the way, they're waiting for the spring thaw to finish cleaning that up.

So, now, I'll give Enbridge credit, it wasn't their pipeline. The pipeline was built by British Petroleum 20 years ago. That's the same BP that is famous for the Gulf of Mexico.

Until the North Dakota spill, Enbridge had claimed the largest spill in our continental U.S., and that's was over an area of Kalamazoo, Michigan, where one of their pipelines ruptured and left 840,000 gallons of tar sands oil into Talmadge Creek, which is a tributary of the Kalamazoo River. That, along with some severe weather, left that oil stain in a stretch of 35 miles of the river. 35 miles is Park Rapids to Wadena. 35 miles is Itasca State Park almost to Bemidji in the Mississippi River.

Now, based on Enbridge's own statistics that they printed in this brochure, which I happened to pick up at the county auditor's office -- it's a very nice brochure -- they admit that they're not 100 percent safe. You know, they bought a real big ad in the Park Rapids Enterprise stating that they're 99.9993 percent safe. That much percentage of their oil that they push through pipelines stays

in the pipe.

So I got to thinking about that, and based on the figures that Enbridge has told us that how much they want to pump through the Sandpiper pipeline, every day they want to move past the town of Park Rapids 375,000 barrels. Now, that's kind of weird 'cause most of us lay people, we don't really know how big a barrel is. A barrel is 42 gallons. That means 15,750,000 gallons of oil are going to be passing through Hubbard County and through the Straight River aquifer, past our lakes, every day. Now, based on their arithmetic, that means that 110 gallons will leak from that pipeline every day. Now, that doesn't seem very much, that's kind of a drop in the bucket when you think about 15 million.

So the question I had for the folks at Enbridge is how soon do you know you're missing that 110 gallons? When you put it in at point A and take it out at point B, how soon does that happen? The valve system that you put on the pipeline, I've heard 15 valves, I've heard 13 valves. Do they measure the quantity of oil going past those points?

And I'm wondering how long it will take the company to find out if that 110 gallons is missing? Will it be a couple hours or a couple days

or will it be two weeks?

Now, they've told us that every two weeks they're going to visually inspect the pipeline, they're going to fly a plane or a helicopter over the route looking for oil leaks. What if there's snow on the ground? That's about five months a year around here.

The other question I had about that is if they don't see it, will the landowner have to find it? Will he have to be a Steve Jensen and see that oil? And if he does find it, is he going to be -- he or she going to be liable for that oil that's on that ground?

The other question I had about that is what if this 110 gallons is over in the Straight River aquifer? A nice sandy, porous soil that might just absorb the oil and disperse it rather than allowing that oil to rise to the surface where we can actually see it.

Now, I know that 110 gallons doesn't sound very much to you guys 'cause you're putting over 15 million through there every day. But I kind of got to wondering, you know, let's -- if that 110 gallons is in the aquifer and ends up in the Park Rapids water system, when mom gives a glass of water

to her kids in the morning, you know, would you want your child to be drinking that? And to think about your kids that are going to Park Rapids schools and are lining up at the fountain after recess.

The other part of that is that oil -potatoes are an interesting product. Because it's a
tuber it's very absorptive. And there's a pretty
decent chance that those potatoes grown out there
are going to get irrigated with water that might
have oil contamination and therefore suck up that
oil. So when you're stopping at the McDonald's up
at the corner of 34 and 71, you know, how about some
oil with those french fries?

So what I'm saying is I think the community and the county has a lot to consider here. And that's my argument for perhaps finding a better place to put this route and not through the heart of our best and cleanest lakes.

But also to give the people who aren't here right now who enjoy those lakes, most of them live on those lakes during the summertime, more time to consider every aspect of this project.

Thank you for listening. Thank you, Mr. Hartman. Thank you, Ms. Smetana.

 $MR.\ LARRY\ HARTMAN:\ The\ next\ speaker\ I'd$

like to call on is Dewane Morgan.

MR. DEWANE MORGAN: I'm going to stand up because if I sit down I might not get up again.

My name is Dewane Morgan, that's

D-E-W-A-N-E, Morgan, M-O-R-G-A-N. I live in

Straight River Township, which is about seven miles as the crow flies southwest of here.

Back in 1972, I had a farm out there, and I was helping one of the neighbors put up hay. And there was -- it looked like an old logging trail with a deer run running up through the woods and I asked what that was. And he explained to me that years ago a pipeline had been put in there. So that pipeline was probably originally put in there in the early 1960s, late 1950s, okay. And there was no markers or anything, it was a game trail running through the woods.

About ten years later they came through and took out some trees and put in another line.

And I was renting land there and had cattle out there, so the owner of the land that got money from the -- from the company putting in the pipeline for redoing the land, seeding it back down, so I seeded that back down. And now, within a couple years later there was another line coming in that went

through -- just nothing through the woods to the tree lines. And back here in '08 there was another line put in. So there's four lines running through there.

One time I asked one of the foreman who was putting through one of the lines, I said why do you keep putting in more lines? And he says, well, you can store a lot of oil in a 24-inch pipe running across the country. So this was some guy from Oklahoma. He didn't live around here, he was just getting paid to do his work.

So the question I ask, back in this state, 1959, 1960, what were the environment standards at that time, for that line original line to be put in? I don't even think there was any. I mean, that's the question you have to ask. And then with each of these lines getting piggybacked onto an original existing line to me is ecological suicide.

And I don't see why this line can't be moved somewhere else, and the three, four lines that are in the ground now be sealed off and rerouted in a more permanent way for energy needs for the future. Because buckling down on them doesn't make it.

And so I'm asking you to re -- you've

heard testimony from experts on the -- on the sand, how sensitive it is around here, it's a sand plain, 2 and I'm saying take that line and move it. 3

long-term view of what you're planning.

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Because there's money being thrown around here to manipulate people's thinking, and there's money being thrown around to put in -- I mean, one point -- what is it, over a billion dollars to put in a line? That's not chump change, okay? you're going to spend money at that, and I have no problems with somebody making a profit, but if you're going to make a profit, make it in an environmentally sound way.

And that's my comments. Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next card I have is for John Hitchcock.

MR. JOHN HITCHCOCK: My name is John Hitchcock, it's H-I-T-C-H-C-O-C-K.

And the last speaker mentioned the energy needs in the United States for the future, and that is a legitimate concern. My question is, and I know that Enbridge is only the transport company, but what do we know of the shipper's intentions to export a significant portion of the oil that is being transported? In other words, are we being

tools for that aspect of a business to sell this oil not to American future needs, but for export to the rest of the world?

That's all. Thanks.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Barry Babcock.

MR. BARRY BABCOCK: Barry Babcock,

B-A-R-Y, B-A-B-C-O-C-K. And I come down from the northeastern part of Hubbard County, I live northeast of Laporte.

Just to tell you a little story. When I was driving down here today I got all set up what I was going to say, I was going to talk about the spills. And as I was driving down 200 just north of what locals call the gulch up on a hill, and on that big hill there was a snag. And on that snag was perched an eagle. And he seen me coming and he jumped off the snag and he flew very low right down the middle of the highway right at me. And he cranked his head around and he looked right at me. And I was bent over the steering wheel looking at him and he said, aani kishamookima (phonetic), what's up, big guy? And I said that I'm going today to talk about your relatives. And he said, miigwech, thank you. So that's why I'm here today.

I want to remind everybody that we live

in headwaters country. This is truly headwaters country here. There's more rivers that start right here than anywhere else in the state.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first fur traders called this country, the French, a tour of terror, hate the land, because so many rivers started here. And the first indigenous people that lived here, they called them the mazebe idium (phonetic), the great man of the Mississippi. This is the sacred river of life, the Mississippi River here. And this river defines not only Indian people, it defines all of us white people that live here. There's nothing more that we find a treasure as the headwaters. And there's over 2,000 miles of Mississippi, but the first 40 miles of this river, from the rocks at Itasca Park to the Mississippi Headwater State Forest to Beltrami County Road 7, is the last remaining 40 miles of wilderness left on the entire 2,500 miles of the Mississippi River.

When we were fighting to keep a bunch of ATVs out of the state forest some years ago, I went to Eco Services and asked them for some information about the river. And I got a whole list of endangered and threatened species and species of special concern, plants and animals. And for

somebody who thinks, well, the Mississippi is all developed here, you haven't been on the headwaters on a summer day when a breeze is flowing through the jack pines and they're talking to you and the water is gin clear. And there's wolves, ma' iingan, the suckers are running in the river, the warblers are coming down, all the muscles 'mussels?, all the plants, the endangered plant species that are Some that are only found in the northeastern part of this county. Mississippi Headwaters State Park they talk about the ram's head orchid. We're imperilling all of that. I know there's already a pipeline going through there, but that's one too many right now. We don't need any more. This river is so special that it defines us as a people.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I spent I -- I grew up on the river in a canoe. And, I mean, if an oil spill was to happen there, and I was all ready to talk about this video I seen of the Kalamazoo River where they're wading through oil. If that happened to this river right here, the Mississippi -- and it isn't just the Mississippi. Another major river starts here, the Crow Wing River, which is just as important to us and the native peoples. These are all major fur

trading routes. And then when you ask where is the best wild ricing, where can I go for the best wild ricing in the solar system? We're standing on it right now. The wild rice is a sacred plant to native people. And I live a semi-subsistent life, I depend on it myself.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the Mississippi River itself would be -- all these rivers in this area that were created in these glacial tunnel beds. And when you get on the Mississippi, when you go down and you get a straight stretch of fast water, it opens up in this great big field of aquatic plants, rice and hay grass and cat fields. And it's a big reservoir. Then you get in another straight shot. And it's over and over and over like that in the first 50, 60 miles of the river all the way to Bemidji. And the big, flat open marshes, when you get into them it's like some big oats field out in North Dakota, it's rice and other aquatic plants, and they'll hold that It's going to settle in them big open oil there. wetlands.

And it's going to have -- when you look at a map, it isn't like the river starts here and it's a straight shot down to the Gulf of Mexico. It starts flowing north and it goes through Bemidji.

And if you look at it on a map, headwaters, we're encircled by that great river of life. It's like the crook on a shepherd's staff. It's going to affect communities, not just Bemidji and Grand Rapids and Cass Lake, but the Twin Cities and even further down river.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is the wrong place to put this pipeline. The pipeline should be going south of the headwaters country here where there aren't these precious rivers and lakes and streams.

UNIDENTIFIED: Exactly.

MR. BARRY BABCOCK: So I know that when I opened this up talking about magissi (phonetic) you probably think that's preposterous, but it's no more preposterous to me than to thinking that the Minnesota Environmental Protection Act that was created so ordinary people like us can have input in these projects has been totally canned. It's not available to us. We're dependent on the Public Utilities Commission. And no offense, but you haven't got a good track record in all of these projects. And I don't think it should be -- I'm saying don't put it north, put it south. Don't put it through Leech Lake. I live near Leech Lake and I worked with the Leech Lake four or five years ago on the Enbridge pipeline and the transmission lines that went through there, they've been punished enough by this stuff. It needs to go outside of lake country, it needs to go somewhere where it's not going to damage our lakes and our rivers because there's not much of this country left.

I'm in my mid 60s, I've lived here most of my life, I've seen how this has transformed and how we've lost these special places that we have here in our back yards. It's time to draw a line in the sand. We're not giving up to industry anymore. Twenty, 30 years from now oil will have less value than water. And we're paying all this money and imperilling these things and damaging them and we're not going to yield overnight. So I say gawee (phonetic)^ gaawiin, no pipeline.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: It's 12:30, it's time for a break for the court reporter. So why don't we break for about 10 minutes or so and reconvene, I've got 12:28, so how about 12:40.

I'll be here if you have questions of me during the break. Enbridge representatives are available if you have questions of them also. And there are other agency representatives here you may want to talk to if you have the opportunity.

1 (Break taken from 12:28 to 12:48.)

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Mick Ryan. I don't see Mick. I'll just defer and call the next card.

Ken Duncanson.

MR. KEN DUNCANSON: I'm not sure about the time constraints, but I'll do my best.

My name is Ken Duncanson. I was born in Bemidji, I graduated from the school across the street here. Some of you might have trouble believing that, but I did. And I'm supposed to be retired. I'm 70 years old. However, I've, for 47 years, operated heavy equipment, including some time spent putting in for Northern Pipeline natural gas lines, and not just in the Minnesota area, so I know a little bit about digging amongst utilities, et cetera.

I don't consider myself a professional on anything with the exception of I am a professional driver. I currently drive motor coaches and busses transporting people on the North Dakota oil fields, primarily dealing with people from Hess and Halliburton.

Because I'm interested in what I am seeing and so forth, I ask questions and I try and learn. There is a great deal of misinformation in

both North Dakota and Minnesota concerning the oil industry.

Did you know that the Hess plant in Tioga, North Dakota is just now firing up from a huge expansion? And then if it is successful and produces the way that it is supposed to that it will be the largest facility in North America and probably the world for some products? They operate with safety being utmost on their mind.

I know because I haul 300 people a day, myself and my fellow drivers, for some time when that plant was being handed on to. I also move Halliburton people. As a matter of fact, last Monday morning I moved with a Greyhound type bus, a charter with Halliburton people. I do that every Monday. And I visit with those people, usually it's a crew of 14 people. I also transport them out to their well sites and they are extremely interested in safety.

As far as pollution, they have a little plastic stand to put their cigarette butts in because they don't want to leave cigarette butts on the job site.

Concerning the oil leak in Tioga, that's about seven miles or so from the village of Tioga

and it's the largest oil spill in North Dakota history. It was a 20-year-old, as has already been stated, six-inch line. The leak was discovered somewhat late because that particular line didn't have detection devices that the modern lines do have, and because of the size it's different regulations.

The mitigation for that spill is ongoing. Because the ground is frozen in North Dakota just like it is here, there is a limit to what you can do. Everything has been done that could be done before that cold blast in November. And they dug down and put trenches in and filled it with rock and have ways of getting the oil out so it isn't polluting the whole area like some people would have you believe. They have a tremendous safety record out there.

And in the newspapers here they have had articles stating how dangerous it is for oil and they ramble back and forth between different subjects with very little knowledge concerning any of them.

I do not profess to be a professional on any of this, but I do know that just because they put a pipeline in, death to our water systems is not

1 imm2 et3 abo

5 how

imminent. They have modern ways, smart pigs, et cetera, that you need to study and find out about, and detection systems. And these gentlemen right here can probably answer your questions as to how frequently they monitor the oil that's going through the pipe and can determine the loss.

And because they make money legitimately by transporting oil and other products, they don't want to have their customers ask questions as to why the oil isn't getting to the end of the pipe.

They're interested in it reaching its destination, extremely so. They also care about our environment here.

I've lived here all my life. However, I just bought a canoe. We enjoy the water of the lakes here and we enjoy the beauty and the pristine water and I have every confidence that it's going to remain that way for years to come.

To address the issue, unless you rode a horse here, you used something to get here that burns petroleum. I have the receipt for when I fueled that motor coach in North Dakota because I haven't turned it in yet. It says that I put 49 point something or other gallons of oil, diesel fuel in that bus to transport people. Oil is a fact of

life.

I think we should be proud that the state next to us has billions and billions of dollars of industry, with a profit to some of the people producing it, to help supply our nation's needs.

And I don't believe that we're shipping it all overseas. And if there is some going overseas, part of the reason is because people have gathered in large groups and objected to refineries being built so that we don't have the refining capacity close. It's just a teaspoonful compared to gallons out there in North Dakota for refining capacity. So then that means you have to move the oil to someplace where they can refine it and then we get it back to use in our vehicles.

There is a great deal of information, misinformation even, in our local paper concerning the fracking process out there. There was a question asked about the chemicals being used, et cetera. I've talked to an individual from Halliburton, most of those chemicals being used are food grain. If you understand what that means, is that you could eat that. The reason being, in an accident --

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, God.

1

2

3

5

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KEN DUNCANSON: The reason being, in an accident, which will occur occasionally, they don't want to pollute the water, they are interested There is, in front of the Tioga museum, a The reason is water tank. It was horse-drawn. because in a great large part of North Dakota, the water wasn't fit to drink when the covered wagons went through here, so they had to haul their water for some distance. A great deal comes out of the Missouri River to the tune of millions of gallons a day to service communities, not just in Williston, but 40, 50 miles away with water. It hasn't been fit to drink for years.

Part of it is because of natural salt.

Everybody here has seen a little blue carton in the grocery stores of Morton salt. There was a company out in North Dakota in the Williston area that produced salt because of a layer of salt, that's where the salt water comes from when the guys are transporting water tankers.

As to the argument as to whether or not we need pipelines, it's the safest way to transport oil that there is. And part of that is a personal experience. One morning, last fall or summer, it was extremely foggy to the point where I didn't feel

I could safely drive my bus and the people I was responsible for at more than 20 miles an hour. Witnesses say that a truck belonging to Triangle ran into a tanker full of crude oil one mile east of Stanley, North Dakota. There is at this point a sign there, a memorial, it says Dave, Tyler and Patrick. Witnesses say that that truck was moving at more than 70 miles an hour, which is the posted speed limit. I couldn't see my hood ornament on the bus and they were dragging 70 miles an hour and they crashed into a crude truck. It burned, they died.

Casselton, North Dakota, I drive by every time I make the trip. I have not stopped to look at the site, but there was a train derailment there and it involved crude oil cars. There was a fire. And I don't care what kind of tank car you build, if you derail a train there is likely to be an oil spill.

A pipeline is the safest way to move oil.

And leaks, as far as leaks, it's a reportable incident. If you start hanging out facts and figures, it's a reportable incident if somebody spills a gallon of drinking water out of one of those tankers. There are different types of water trucks. There's salt tankers, there's flow-back tankers, there's fresh water tankers, which is what

1 I just said.

A small trucking company that I worked for for about a month and a half in North Dakota had to report an incident because we spilled a gallon of drinkable water, potable water, out of the hose in the back of this truck. That's an incident. Part of those facts and figures, supposed, that deny that 100 percent safety record, which really is not attainable, would be a one-gallon fresh water spill.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

MR. KEN DUNCANSON: It is. I can give you the name and phone number of the fellow that spilled a gallon of water.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Ken, could we -- are you about done?

MR. KEN DUNCANSON: I'm about done.

I apologize for rambling back and forth over different subjects, but the newspaper has been printing stuff that has little basis in fact and doesn't concern the pipeline.

 $\label{eq:continuous} I \mbox{ appreciate the attendance and } I$ $\mbox{appreciate your attention.}$

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card, Mick Ryan. Is Mr. Ryan here?

Lowell Schellack. Schellack?

_ _

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: I'm going to sit down. My name is Lowell Schellack. The first name is Lowell, L-O-W-E-L-L, the last name is Schellack, it's spelled S-C-H-E-L-L-A-C-K.

As I said, my name is Lowell Schellack, and my wife and I live on Hay Creek in Arago
Township, Hubbard County. Hay Creek is a tributary of Island Lake, which is about a mile -- Hay Creek is a tributary of Island Lake. Island Lake is about a mile below our house. Island Lake flows into Eagle Lake. Eagle Lake flows into Potato Lake.

Potato Lake flows into Fish Hook Lake. And the Fish Hook River exits Crooked Lake and flows through Park Rapids. The proposed Sandpiper Pipeline crosses one mile above my house on Hay Creek.

I have a question and I would like to have an answer. My question is two parts. What is the statistical probability of a leak or a spill in the Sandpiper Pipeline? And the second part is, is it possible there could be a major leak of oil into Hay Creek? I don't know who to direct this to, but I would like somebody to address that.

MR. JOHN GASELE: Hi, Lowell. Well, sorry, the microphone was a little louder than I expected there.

_

My name is John Gasele, I'm an attorney that's helping North Dakota Pipeline Company with the application process. We didn't have a moment to introduce our panel here at the beginning.

Just to give everybody a bit of background as to why we're here today. North Dakota Pipeline Company brought out the folks that are responsible for the design, construction, and operation of the pipeline. Because this is a scoping meeting, it's a chance for us to find out what the public is interested in having included in the environmental review process, find out your comments, hear your concerns, point you to information in the application if we can.

With that said, I can pass the microphone down. I don't know that there's going to be an exact statistic to give you, but we can certainly pass the microphone down to the folks here. Just so folks know, this is a scoping process, so we're really here to gather your comments and find out what you would like to have included in the environmental review process as this moves ahead.

As both Larry and Tracy said in the very beginning, this is the very beginning of the process. It's not the spot where we're stating the

merits of the project or we're doing anything other than really gathering information about what would be reviewed as the process moves ahead. So, with that, I will pass the microphone down.

MR. BARRY SIMONSON: There we go. It's on.

I can answer, since I manage engineering and construction I can tell you a little bit about what we do in order to make sure that our pipeline is designed and constructed to high standards.

In terms of the steel that we use, it's high grade steel. When we -- when we perform our design calculations in order to determine what the appropriate wall thickness we have, there's a design factor that's a safety factor, essentially, that's dictated by PHMSA, which is DOT part 195. So the wall thickness that we use is according to the safety standards, and the wall thickness for the Sandpiper is actually higher than that.

And specifically in Hubbard County, if you look at the rivers and streams and, like the Straight River was mentioned earlier and a few others like Fish Hook River, we're utilizing different installation methods. We're using a higher, thicker wall thickness for a lot of those

crossings. From a little bit less than a half inch to over a half inch, actually a .531-inch wall thickness.

One of the other factors that I think is a statistic that is important for Hubbard County with all the sensitivities of all the waters and streams here, is that within this county, 20 percent of the route in Minnesota contains about 35 to 40 percent of the actual block valves that are utilized. So that's one of the safeguards that we're recognizing as important to the county and to the environment and to the landowners.

One other thing that we do from a construction perspective is all the block valves that we do have have pressure sensitivity devices upstream and downstream of each valve so our operational control center can monitor that in real-time.

And I hope from the design and engineering perspective that that answers your question. And I can answer more individually if you have more questions for me later.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: I appreciate your detailed answer to my question. And that gives you an attempt to build the safest pipeline possible,

but you didn't answer my one question. And I would like this to be a yes or no answer.

Is it possible for the pipeline to rupture and spill crude oil into the Hay Creek that I live on, and is it possible that I could have crude oil flowing past my door? Is it yes or no?

MR. MARK CURWIN: Hi, Lowell. My name is Mark Curwin and I'm with our major projects management team out of the Superior office.

Anything is possible, we all know that. There are no guarantees in life.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Okay. Well, I'll take that as a yes, then.

Okay. Since now there is a possibility of that, has there been a study done to determine the effects of a crude oil spill and subsequent flow through the chain of lakes that I've mentioned? And has the study addressed the impact on fisheries, tourism, real estate values, and quality of life for residents along the spill? My question is, has there been a study to determine the effects of a crude oil spill in the area?

MR. MARK CURWIN: That's part of what the environmental review process will be for this project.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Okay. So you will -- okay. No study has been done to date, but, okay, will there be an environmental impact statement done, similar to the one that was done for the Pebble Mine project in Bristol Bay, Alaska? Will there be an environmental impact statement done?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Under the alternative review process it's called something different. We try to provide equivalent information. That's one of the purposes of these meetings, is to find out what the concerns are so they can be incorporated into the document that will be prepared for this project.

I'm not familiar with the study you referred to in Alaska, though. But it's a similar document. A lot of the information will be similar. Is it, again, equal to an EIS process, no, it is not, there is no draft and there is not a final document, it's just the document. The public -- excuse me. A contested case hearing will be held on it, it will give you the opportunity for questions on that docket to be raised or addressed also.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Okay. So there is not -- there is not an environmental impact

statement planned at this time. What would be the driving force that it would take to promote getting an environmental impact statement?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I'm trying to answer your question. When the rules were adopted back in 1988, they built the -- basically, most of the environmental review requirements into the rulemaking process. So rather than a two-track process, say, if you have parallel railroad tracks, too, you have an EIS process and you have a permitting process. Rather than running those separately, the process is designed to incorporate the elements of environmental review into the permitting process. So rather than two separate procedures -- well, I guess there still is two because we have the certificate of need, which is also a parallel process. But the comparative environmental analysis aspect is designed to pick up the components of the environmental review, otherwise it wouldn't have been approved of as a form of alternative review. And that decision was made by the EQB in, I believe, February of 1989, if I recall correctly. So there will be an environmental document, it is just not called an EIS.

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Well, as I understand it, the comparative review is not the same as an environmental impact statement. And it would be my request that a full environmental impact statement be done on the project.

On a little different track. concerned about how much land is being disturbed by the pipeline project. I haven't had access to the construction plans so I don't know how wide your average right-of-way is for construction. make a calculation, assuming an average width of new right-of-way to be 100 feet, or 100 feet of the width of the pipeline. That calculates to 3,634 acres, or 5.68 sections of land in what is roughly 300 feet -- 300 miles in Minnesota. And it calculates to 642 acres, one section of land, is in Hubbard County. Now, that's based on a 100-foot right-of-way. I guess I would like to ask the design people, are those numbers in the ballpark in your estimation?

MR. MARK CURWIN: The easement that we're seeking to acquire for the pipeline is a 50-foot-wide easement, a permanent 50-foot-wide easement, not 100.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Well, will all of

1 your construction activities be confined within that 50-foot corridor? 2 MR. MARK CURWIN: No, there's temporary 3 4 work space meant for construction, which is 5 obviously restored postconstruction as well. MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: And how wide would 6 that be? 7 MR. MARK CURWIN: It's up to a maximum of 8 9 120 feet for the temporary work space. In some 10 locations it's less than that. 11 MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: So up to 120 feet. 12 And I took an average of 100 feet, so would my 13 calculations be in the ballpark then? 14 MR. MARK CURWIN: Probably somewhere in 15 the ballpark, but I wasn't doing the math with you 16 as you were reciting that. 17 MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Okay. Thank you. 18 I have read stories of homeowners being 19 actually displaced because of the spill in the 20 Kalamazoo River in Michigan. I'm 73 years old and 21 I've worked all my life up until six years ago. 22 I've worked hard and I want to enjoy my retirement 23 and in a beautiful setting and Hay Creek is a 24 beautiful setting. If there is a spill, and we've 25 established that anything is possible, if there is a spill and crude oil flows past my house, will I be compensated for my loss of property and quality of life? And the second part of that is who will be responsible to compensate me?

MR. MARK CURWIN: We're responsible for

MR. MARK CURWIN: We're responsible for all of our activities, Lowell. So if you were impacted by our activities, whether it's during construction or during operation of the pipeline, then we would be addressing that with you, that's correct.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: In the past has Enbridge ever had to compensate people for loss of property and loss of quality of life and were they satisfied?

MR. MARK CURWIN: That's a pretty broad question. Maybe I will put it in the context of the comment you just made about our Marshall incident. In fact, no one was displaced in that incident. There was a voluntary short-term evacuation in a very limited area. Enbridge then implemented some compensation programs that people were eligible to participate in. But no one was required to leave their home permanently.

MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: My hearing isn't too good. Was that the Kalamazoo River?

1 MR. MARK CURWIN: That's correct. MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: 2 That's the one you were talking about? 3 4 MR. MARK CURWIN: Yes. 5 MR. LOWELL SCHELLACK: Along with being 73 years old, I don't hear very good anymore either. One of the joys of getting old. 7 Gentlemen, thank you for your time and 8 your answers. But I think the review process is 9 10 moving too fast. I request that you extend the 11 public review process until August 1st. 12 residents of Hubbard County are gone for the winter 13 and have not had the opportunity to evaluate or 14 comment on the project. 15 We are trying to look at alternative 16 routes to help you in picking your route and we just 17 have not had enough time to do that. We would like 18 to participate more fully in the routing process and 19 we hope that you would give us more time. 20 And I thank you for the opportunity to 21 appear before you today. 22 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you, Lowell. 23 The next speaker apparently has another 24 commitment so I'm kind of pushing his card up. Jeff 25 Mosner.

And I've got 17 cards left and we've got 1 about 45 minutes left on the schedule. So out of 2 3 consideration, I guess, of your fellow citizens or 4 colleagues, I'd like to ask you to perhaps 5 abbreviate your comments if you can so everybody does get a chance to speak. And let's go to Jeff then if you're here. 7 UNIDENTIFIED: He left. 8 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: 9 10 MS. MARY ADAMS: I'm to speak for him. 11 He gave me this. 12 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: 0h. If it's a 13 prepared statement, could you just maybe just 14 summarize it and give it to the court reporter, 15 then, and it'll be put into the record? 16 MS. MARY ADAMS: No, I can't, because I 17 was just given it. Jeff Mosner could not be here, 18 he had an appointment, and he asked if I would read 19 this for him. If I would -- would that be okay? 20 I'll move it along. This is important. 21 This is from Jeff Mosner, J-E-F-F, 22 M-O-S-N-E-R, a resident of Park Rapids. 23 COURT REPORTER: And your name, please? 24 MS. MARY ADAMS: Mary, M-A-R-Y, A-D-A-M-S. Mary Adams. 25

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

2

MS. MARY ADAMS: This is Jeff speaking.

3

4 share.

quote, unquote, route.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have two main concerns that I'd like to First is the apparent flaws inherent in the, quote, unquote, needs process. And second, the environmental concerns related to the proposed,

My concerns with this need process is that it appears to be severely tilted in favor of the oil industry. According to the January 31st PUC notice, that this is the first opportunity for the public to make its concerns known. These concerns, as stated in the notice, are to be limited to proposing of alternative routes or segments.

The notice states that the PUC must rule on a certificate of need as well as the route, and that further hearings will occur after the Department of Commerce has done a comparative environmental analysis.

It appears to me you've got the proverbial cart before the horse. For example, say you are a homeowner and you're thinking about building a shed. Now, wouldn't you consider all of the reasons why you need the shed before you think about where you're going to put it? Unless, of

course, you're trying to fly the shed under the radar of your spouse. Oh, yeah.

I wonder if that is what Enbridge, aided by the PUC, is attempting to do. Let us think we have input into this process by picking a route, but the actual need for the pipeline never gets adequately vetted. Heck, Enbridge, a foreign company, is already offering easement contracts to landowners in this county. Now, I may have spent too much time cooped up in my ice shack this winter, but something does not smell right here.

Also, when you look at need, this should not solely be Enbridge's need to move oil and make a profit. Enbridge claims this pipeline will help the U.S. break its reliance on foreign oil. However, Enbridge has dodged the PUC's request to provide the designation of this proposal they propose to ship through our country. Wouldn't we be the fools to find out we allowed the pipeline to compromise this pristine environment so that the oil industry can profit by selling the refined petroleum products to foreign countries?

Okay. So let's assume we are provided ironclad assurances that this oil and its refined output will indeed benefit the United States.

Now I'd like to address my second concern. The environment. While the, quote, unquote, glossies put out by Enbridge boast of their attention to safety, sadly, their history and actions tell us a very different story.

Hubbard County is blessed with natural resources that are the envy of most other areas. It is what drew my wife and I to settle and live our retirement years here. It is the whole of Minnesota's oldest and most visited state park, Itasca. Visited by more than 500,000 people a year. Itasca State Park is the home to a major research center for the University of Minnesota, its very name is derived from its honor to be the source of our nation's third longest river, the Mississippi.

It's a very -- oops. The Mississippi
River is one of the world's major river systems in size, habitat, diversity, and biological productivity. The Mississippi watershed is the fourth largest in the world and measures approximately 1.2 million square miles, covering about 40 percent of the lower 48 states. It's depended upon by over 50 million people for their drinking water.

The proposed Sandpiper Pipeline crosses

this watershed in multiple locations on its way to
Superior. And in Hubbard County the pipeline also
would cross the Straight River, one of the few
natural producing brown trout streams in northern
Minnesota.

It will also cross the Shell and Crow Wing Rivers, as well as Hay Creek, which flows into the very popular Island, Eagle, Potato and Fish Hook chain of lakes before bringing it to Fish Hook River, which flows right through the heart of our land. Imagine a major oil spill in one of these rivers. That nightmare happened in July of 2010 in Michigan when one of Enbridge's pipelines ruptured and caused a million gallons of tar sands crude oil into a small tributary of the Kalamazoo River, causing irreversible damage to the river and to its community. Enbridge is still attempting to clean up the spill, the largest spill in U.S. history.

Can I read a little more? Are you okay?
UNIDENTIFIED: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. MARY ADAMS: Just a little more?

Okay. 'Cause I would maybe skip, but maybe I shouldn't skip it.

UNIDENTIFIED: Please.

UNIDENTIFIED: Go on.

MS. MARY ADAMS: There is a proposal to transport fracked oil from the Bakken deposit in North Dakota. While its highly volatile oil is bad enough due to the carcinogenic chemicals that need to be used in the fracking process, now we are hearing news that they are considering sending tar sands oil extracted in Canada down the Sandpiper corridor.

It would be nothing short of an environmental crime to have tar sands oil transported to our country. And once the pipeline is approved, there is nothing stopping Enbridge from shipping whatever they want through it.

Tar sands oil is a sludgy form of bitumen or asphalt diluted with gas condensate made from a plethora of carcinogenic chemicals needed to make it flow. The higher temperatures in pressure make it more corrosive and leads to greater chances of pipeline breakage. Again, this is the stuff that breached Enbridge's pipeline in Michigan.

Back to our blue river trout streams.

Pipelines have had some serious consequences for high quality trout streams and wetlands in Minnesota. Would anyone from Enbridge care to describe these events? What material escapes into

our streams during these incidents, commonly called, quote, unquote, frack-outs? And if they had done any long-term studies of impacts of these chemicals? And why don't they seem to be prevented?

We recently learned that the aquifer used for Park Rapids water has been compromised by nitrates due to regular applications of fertilizer on our surrounding ag fields. Park Rapids residents have been notified they will need to foot the bill for a \$2.5 million water treatment facility. This problem is made worse because of the relatively porous soil and shallow aquifers.

A pipeline carrying dirty oil across this land is a catastrophe waiting to happen. Studies of pipeline safety find that the probability of major leaks and spills is surprisingly high, virtually guaranteeing the major leaks or spills over the life of the line.

And the last point that Jeff wants to make is, I'd like to make -- the last points I'd like to make have to do with the timeline of this project. Scheduling all of these public meetings during the peak time of the year when many residents of our lake country goes south is, at best, poor judgment and, at worst, covert.

So include me in the long and growing list of folks and organizations who are requesting an extension to this comment period. Regardless of how you rule on that request, I also urge you to do a full environmental impact study on this project as soon as possible. The risk to the highly vulnerable lakes, rivers, wetlands and watersheds in our community demand it.

Jeff says thank you for listening. Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Maurice Spangler.

DR. MAURICE SPANGLER: Can you hear me?

My name is Maurice, M-A-U-R-I-C-E, Spangler,

S-P-A-N-G-L-E-R. I'm a retired family practitioner

from Park Rapids and I have the same concerns as a

number of the people here have expounded.

I'm very fearful of a severe spill, of oil leaking on Fish Hook Lake. Enbridge cannot guarantee an absolute lack of spills and that means that there eventually will be a spill somewhere.

As a physician, I believe that preventing a disease or an accident is much preferable to treating it after it occurs. And preventing an oil spill would be in the same category.

And I'm not going to go through all the

concerns that other people have brought up, but I
have one question. Since the Exxon Valdez disaster
in Alaska, double-hulled tankers are, I understand,
being used more to transport oil. Why can't
pipelines be double hulled?

MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Thanks for your

question. In terms of the design requirements, we are adhering to all the federal requirements that are conducted by PHMSA, Federal Pipeline

Administration -- Pipeline Hazardous Materials

Safety Administration, excuse me. So in terms of DOT part 195 design requirements that I alluded to earlier, there is a design factor that we have to incorporate into a pipeline design, which is .72.

So we take that into account based on what the maximum allowable operating pressure can be of the pipeline. So in terms of your double hull question, there's a thickness requirement that we have to have, that is part of the requirement that we abide by in our design.

DR. MAURICE SPANGLER: So there are -you do have double hulled pipelines, where if the
inner hull ruptures, and then you have the outer
hull?

MR. BARRY SIMONSON: No, on a new

pipeline we do not.

DR. MAURICE SPANGLER: I think that might be something to consider. Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Sharon Natzel.

MS. SHARON NATZEL: Thank you. My name is Sharon Natzel, and that's S-H-A-R-O-N, Natzel is N-A-T-Z-E-L.

I have a lot of comments and questions, but I know we only have five minutes, so I just want to know if I do just my key highlights and then hand it in as a comment and question, is that still the same as saying it verbally?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: That's fine.

MS. SHARON NATZEL: Okay. I wanted to let everybody know that I noticed in reviewing the Sandpiper Pipeline documentation in the docket 13-474, that on the newspaper list and table, Northwoods Press was not asterisked appropriately as the official Hubbard County newspaper, the asterisk was on the other local paper.

There was also a difference in what route information was indicated to be published between these two newspaper lists. The Northwoods Press had only one route and the other local newspaper had two routes listed on the table in the Hubbard County

area. I'm very concerned that we in Hubbard County and the general public were not notified properly if the official Hubbard County newspaper did not contain all the route notifications. Because of this inaccuracy, I'm concerned how much important public information and notification concerning both the pipeline certificate of need and the route permit hasn't been communicated properly to us here in Hubbard County.

I believe that a time extension of at least August 1st, 2014 and additional public meetings should be held in Hubbard County to allow for full review of both. All the extended public meetings I'm hearing should be in the official newspaper of Hubbard County, the Northwoods Press. Plus, continue with the other local paper, too, 'cause the general public will now expect to be informed that way as in the past on this project.

Okay. I'll skip a couple.

Okay. In document 13-474 there is one valve listed for Hubbard County at milepost 445.1. This valve listed on the Table 1.2.4-1 proposed above-ground facilities for the Sandpiper Pipeline project.

The valve prior to Hubbard County valve

is milepost 403.6 in Clearwater County. That means there would be 41.5 miles between valves in this situation. The next valve immediately after Hubbard County valve is at milepost 479.4 in Cass County. That would be 34.3 miles between the two valves. For these three counties, there are 75 water bodies crossed, not including wetlands. Based on the Table 9.2.1, summaries of water bodies crossed by the Sandpiper Pipeline project.

This small number of valves is a concern in case of a leak or spill where an emergency shutoff is required to prevent pollution of the water and other natural resources. This is one reason that an environmental impact statement should be looked into.

I'll skip a few more.

Okay. In the 9.1 major basins and watershed section of 13-474, there's a diagram based on USGS 2013 showing the surface waters crossed by the preferred route are located in four major basins. These major watershed waters meet both Canada and the U.S. The square mile surface drainage area within the United States is 76,291 square miles. Of concern would be any leak or spill that affects one or more major basins. A spill,

leak, or sabotage could cause a national security risk to our water supplies here in the United States depending on the amount or locations. I feel that a full EIS is necessary to protect our United States water resources.

In the Upper Mississippi River source, water protection project information, on their website, a 1980 study is cited where 18 million people used the Mississippi River watershed for drinking water.

I'll skip a few more.

Okay. In the 14-474 it talks about where you're actually testing the pipeline after it's installed in places. And it talks about appropriating water. I want to know if there are limits to the appropriate amounts of water and time of year that appropriation of water is done when you are testing the pipeline. And if it's for each water body that these limits are.

What rights regarding water appropriation does NDPC receive with the Sandpiper Pipeline specifically?

Are there water appropriation rights that are related to the right-of-way that NDPC will gain through the Sandpiper project? Is there an

expiration date or time limit on the water appropriation rights and limits for NDPC? What state and federal agencies have oversight of the water appropriation rights of NDPC?

I'll skip a couple.

The project doesn't speak to monitoring for acts of sabotage. What monitors will be utilized to protect the pipeline and, in turn, our waters and agricultural lands from spills or leaks? For example, on the Trans-Alaska pipeline, it seems that there may be more frequent checks than 26 times per year, especially at key points along the structure based on information received in a tour in Alaska in 2013.

Does the aboveground pipeline implementation method allow for enhanced monitoring through cameras and other sensors on the inside and outside? Has this method of pipeline installation been evaluated and compared to the buried Sandpiper Pipeline proposed. Has an environmental risk comparison been done on the aboveground type of pipeline as compared to the underground? And also the risk comparison, in addition to the four methods of the installation techniques named in the project documentation? Are there other methods of pipeline

implementation that are available to consider, too, and what are the safety features of each?

 $\hbox{And I'm skipping a whole bunch, but I} \\$ will submit it in comments.

Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: To answer your question, the DNR does the water appropriations permit. The discharge permit is issued by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. And, again, as I mentioned earlier, they have made their application to the United States Army Corps of Engineers who reviews all wetland and associated waters that drains in through the -- that wetlands drain into.

The next speaker card I have is Frank, B-I-B-E-A-N, I believe.

MR. FRANK BIBEAU: My name is Frank
Bibeau, B-I-B-E-A-U. Most of you know me around
here from Indian country of White Earth and Leech
Lake, I've been a tribal attorney at Leech Lake and
I've worked at White Earth and I'm very familiar
with the area and what's going on.

And in the last couple of years, Peter Erlinder and I have been working through some of these treaty rights in a way that I don't think this

PUC understands. And we're going to be making those arguments coming up because I don't believe the PUC by itself has the jurisdiction to give 100 percent consent when it's crossing through our ceded territories where we have other rights. Not just to hunt, fish, and gather, but to protect the environment. Normally there would be a do-nothing alternative and that's what we would talk about here today.

Mark Curwin, I've known Mark for a few years when the pipeline came through Leech Lake. And I told him that I believe the corridor should be going down I-94. And maybe even aboveground. I was at a PUC meeting, I'll say ten years ago, when they were talking about how the timber harvesting should be working. Where is the timber industry now? Where is the board industry? A lot of it's gone. They decided they could have a sustainable harvest by doubling the harvest. And what they did was they harvested the industries and half the industries are left.

So I've heard a lot of very clear explanations of what's going on. But I can tell you right now that the pipeline as it exists and how it's proposed not only is going to interfere with

the Mississippi watershed, but the Lake Superior watershed and the Huron -- not Huron, but Hudson.

So essentially that's the whole North American east side of the continent.

I know Enbridge cleans things up,
Enbridge pays for a lot of things. Enbridge gives a
lot of things to communities and creates jobs and it
does all this. I was also passing through Cohasset
when they had the big oil spill there probably ten
years ago. Now, that was in the middle of the
summer. That was Fourth of July weekend. And I can
tell you, it was shocking to see the black plume
going up into the sky miles and miles and it was
blowing towards Leech Lake Reservation.

Now, I would also tell you that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency did not want Leech Lake to participate in any of the cleanup that was going on because it was considered off reservation. Enbridge actually was the one who did invite us to participate. So you don't know who is really there for you when things are happening. And I'm not saying Enbridge was there, I'm saying the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency wasn't.

Now, normally our rights only run through our treaties with the United States of America.

There is no jurisdiction granted to the State of Minnesota to deal with our rights through treaties in federal statutes. And that doesn't mean just on our reservation, it means off reservation. And so I can tell you there's going to be some other things that have to be looked at for this corridor. Because the areas that are being crossed here are very important for us culturally, historically, and for everyone's survival.

I know we can't fix everything and make the pipelines go where they should, but we live in an area full of risk. It's very full of water, very full, okay. And that's what everybody is talking about here today and that's what everybody needs to think about. I understand we're going to have pipelines. I understand I came here in a car. I told the PUC ten years ago that I used toilet paper and read the newspaper. It didn't mean I wanted all the trees cut.

That's what we need to be talking about and thinking about, and we will be. It's a tough issue and we're all going to have to work together on this. But I know that working with Honor the Earth on this project, our goal is to stop this pipeline.

1 Oh, I'm sorry. It was 1992 for the Cohasset spill, I just remember the Fourth of July. 2 3 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: History goes pretty 4 fast. 5 The next speaker card I have is David Schornack -- S-C-H-O-R-N, either A or E-C-K. 6 UNIDENTIFIED: He had to leave. 7 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: 8 Okay. And I have a 9 note from Casey, who is helping me in the back there 10 by the maps, to please ask K-R-O-O-K-E-N in Clover 11 Township to see Casey in the back about some maps. 12 MS. CASEY NELSON: The last name is 13 If she is still here, come meet me in the 14 back area by the maps. 15 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker I 16 have is Peter Erlinder. 17 MR. PETER ERLINDER: Ηi. My name is 18 Peter Erlinder, I'm a professor of law at William 19 Mitchell Law School in St. Paul, and I partner with 20 Frank, and I'm doing work to identify the rights 21 that native people have in Minnesota. 22 And it so happens that the U.S. Supreme 23 Court has created a new area of rights that have 24 largely gone unrecognized until recently. But it's

likely that this area of rights is going to have an

25

impact not only on this question, and I think the Enbridge case may be one of the first cases that has an opportunity to explore this, but you remember that there was this Mille Lacs case about 12, 15 years ago. And in that case the Supreme Court held that the cases from the 1800s that -- or the treaties from the 1800s were still valid in the 20th century. And that case was decided on a five to four vote. So it was viewed as perhaps kind of a marginal sort of decision.

But if you read the case closely, what you see is that every member of the Supreme Court agreed with one basic principle. And the basic principle was that if the treaty negotiators from the U.S. government said that the native people had the right to hunt and fish and gather, even if they didn't own the land, it was like having mineral rights for a mining company. So even if the mineral company -- even if the mining company didn't own the land, right, they still had the mineral rights.

And that same thing is true for Indian people. Even if they didn't own the land, they still retained the hunting and fishing rights as property. Those are called usufructory property rights. And those property rights go back into

Roman times, that the Roman Empire had to protect, because people before the Roman Empire were hunters and gatherers. And the hunters and gatherers on the Italian peninsula insisted that their rights be protected from the Roman Empire. And so it had to be written into Roman law, and that was written into English common law, and that was written into American law, and the Supreme Court said it's written into modern law.

So the Indian people have usufructuary property rights wherever U.S. treaty negotiators put it into the treaty. And do you know where they put it into the treaty? Everywhere in northern Minnesota. Every place. That was those treaty negotiators who did it, it wasn't the Indians. Ha?

Now, a unanimous Supreme Court said that. But almost no one figured it out until Frank and I started doing some historical research and we figured it out. About three months ago, a federal judge in Minneapolis, Judge Tunheim, dismissed a bunch of federal prosecutions against native people taking fish on the reservation because the Judge realized that the Indians had usufructuary property rights on their own reservation so they couldn't be prosecuted for taking fish on their own reservation.

So the idea that Indians have usufructuary property rights that have to be protected anywhere that a treaty covered those rights, not just on the res, but off res, has also already been recognized in Crandon, Wisconsin, where there was a mine that was attempted to be sited off reservation, and there was an environmental impact statement saying that if the mine was going to affect hunting and fishing and gathering off reservation, ha, and have a cultural effect off reservation, that that all had to be taken into consideration also. Which has not been part of the way that Minnesota has done things yet, but it has been done that way in Wisconsin. So that's the Crandon mine EIS precedent that we'll probably be citing for you.

But the thing that I wanted to make sure that the people in northern Minnesota know is that if you're not an Indian, the hunting, fishing, and gathering rights that native people have are going to protect the environment for all of us. Because those property rights, as we know, are sacred in the U.S. Constitution. Because property cannot be taken without due process of law. And there's nothing more sacred to capitalism than property. Right?

And Indians have usufructuary property rights to make sure their hunting and fishing and gathering rights will not be taken away, and their hunting, fishing, and gathering rights will protect the pristine wilderness that we all need for the seventh generation. And if we're smart enough -- and if we're smart enough to help the native people protect their property rights, their property rights will protect our property rights.

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

MR. PETER ERLINDER: Right? So there is the chance in this gift that the U.S. Supreme Court gave us in the Mille Lacs opinion to change the power relationships so that all of the people who value the environment, rather than just property alone, can make common cause. And so let's get together and try and do it, to save the environment which is the usufructuary property that we all want, not just property alone.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card

I have is Thomas Ferrarell.

MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: Okay. I got a couple of questions for the Department of Commerce and the PUC. So my first question is for Larry.

COURT REPORTER: You never stated your

1 name and spelled it.

MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: Oh, I'm sorry.

Thomas Ferrarell, F-E-R-R-A-R-E-L-L.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: I was at the meeting in Crookston last week when you shared that pipelines are safer than rail transportation as a method to get from point A to point B. You were asked how you came to that conclusion and you based it off your own personal opinion and unnamed studies that you, quote, typically read. Sorry, excuse me.

So I wanted to offer two studies on that issue. One was done by the American Association of Railroads using data from the US Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration from 02 of '12 and showed that there were over 14 times as many crude oil spills from pipelines than by rail. And of those spills, over -- or 200 times as many gallons of crude oil spilled by pipelines as compared to rail.

And there was another one by the International Energy Agency with data from the U.S. Department of Transportation showing that for each mile traveled, three times as much -- there are three times as many spills per mile traveled by

1 pipelines rather than rail. So that was just talking about -- the mic went dead. 2 All right. So that was just talking 3 4 about spills. MR. BARRY SIMONSON: 5 Use this one. MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: Good? All right, 6 7 cool. That was talking about spills, and you 8 were talking about was safety, and that was your, 9 10 you know, your personal opinion that they're safer. So I was curious what -- the question is what is 11 12 your definition of safety? 13 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Do you want to ask 14 your questions and I'll respond once rather than 15 switching back and forth? 16 MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: That's fine. 17 My other question was about the 18 comparative environmental review analysis. 19 still not really clear to me. What is that being 20 compared to? Like, what would come out of it? 21 it proposed -- Enbridge proposed pipeline is safer 22 than some other person's proposed pipeline? Is that 23 how it works? 24 And then the other questions are, is our

only opportunity of the public to reject this

25

2

3

4

5

7 8

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

pipeline during the comment period on the validity of the certificate of need? When is that and when does it end?

And the last question is how is it in the public's interest to be discussing a route we cannot see before its need is even determined?

And even after, I think, Enbridge has paid for easements. Can you confirm that?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: My comment regarding safety, and I believe that I said that is based on the documents I reviewed, historical documents. Now, again, I've looked for some updated ones, I did come across a few. Obviously you disagree with my opinion so I'll just indicate that if you're interested in pursuing the data, pursue the research, but also look at the metrics behind each of those documents is how these comparisons are made so you're looking at equivalency in terms of, you know, barrels per mile or gallons per whatever, and draw your own conclusions.

With regard to the permitting process by the PUC. Again, there are two documents. One is a certificate of need and the other is the pipeline routing permit that they applied for. The processes run in parallel, in sequence, so the need process

addresses need-related issues. My side of the ledger or the side that I work with, it's more location related. Again, the decisions are made by the PUC in sequential order. If they determine there's no need for the pipeline, then there's no pipeline routing permit issued. If they determine there is a need for it, then our task, or the Commission's task is to determine the best location for that pipeline. And then if that decision is made and it's permitted, there are permit conditions, we also include special conditions based on information in the record.

And I believe I might have -- the opportunity to propose routes, you know, by -- that's established, we had asked for a variance to allow more time than what the rules provide. Again, with the extension it came out on April 4th. Now, again, I realize that to a lot of people it may not make sense to continue the process and decide need, need first and then the route. Again, because they're running in parallel, this is the only opportunity to set additional line routes at this point in time. It's just the way the permitting process has been set up and established.

And I think you had one question on need

that I didn't quite exactly hear clearly what you said. So could you restate that and then I'll try to answer.

MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: Okay. The last question that I read out was how is it in the public's interest to be discussing a route that we can't see before its need is even determined. So it was right now we're commenting on alternatives or proposing alternative routes, right? And then after this comes our opportunity to comment on the certificate of need. Is that correct?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The certificate of need process is a little bit more evidentiary in nature, not some of the public participation components. That will be, I guess, addressed by the administrative law judge at the prehearing conference next Monday.

The -- when the hearings are held sometime this fall, they'd be joint hearings, so they will discuss both for the public and then provide comments on both need for the project, as well as the Department of Commerce, the other members from the Department of Commerce who just work on need related issues. All of their testimony will be prefiled, as required by the rules and

__

available for public review. The public is certainly free to comment either on the certificate of need process and/or the route permit selection process during the hearings presided over by an administrative law judge.

MR. THOMAS FERRARELL: Okay. When we're talking about the safety of train rail versus pipelines, you're saying that you have studies that you're referring to to come to that conclusion. Do we get to see those studies only after the comparative environmental analysis is released? Because it's my understanding that at that point we can't comment on it, there's no more public involvement.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Certainly, feel free to comment on it. If you go to the National Transportation Safety Board pages and the Federal Office of Pipeline Safety, they have some studies or links to studies there that -- they're there for public review, they're certainly not proprietary or anything else. Just Google them and I'm sure you can find any number of sources.

I would consider what's posted on the National Transportation Safety Board to be the most accurate ones, but, again, draw your own conclusion

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

11

14

13

16

15

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

or opinion on that. I can, again, provide you, if you give me your name and address or e-mail, I can forward some of those references to you electronically. And I'm not saying it's complete or comprehensive, but it's some of the more recent ones.

The next speaker I had was Richard Bogart (phonetic).

UNIDENTIFIED: Bogart left.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Okay. Jasmine Larson.

MS. JASMINE LARSON: (Ojibwe). I'm with the Bear Head Clan, and you are about to affect the waters that my family for many, many years, my grandpa, my uncles, my aunties even, my friends, they all rice, they all leech, they all live off this land. Everything, our water is everything to It is the blood of the earth. I don't know why you need to go through the headwaters in order to contaminate all our stuff in order to make your pockets full. It doesn't add up to me why. You say your measurements are 54 inches into the ground, when frost goes six feet, ten feet this year, what's going to happen when your pipes freeze up? going to happen when it's frost out until March?

2

3

4

5

Ь

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what I want to tell you right now is that you're not only affecting us in this building, but you're affecting everybody. All our spirits, all the trees, all the fish. Everybody. Everything. Things that you guys don't think of, every leaf on the tree. What's going to happen when we don't have these resources? What's going to happen to the generations ahead of us? What's going

to happen to my grandchildren? Yeah, right.

I don't understand why you need to put it here. You have everywhere in the nation to put it. Why pollute our waters? Do you think we're stupid that you put this map up here and it doesn't have the Mississippi River? I know my geography. I know my reservation. I drive every day from Leech Lake. Or I'm from White Earth, but I drive to Leech Lake to go to school. I see pipelines all across there. You guys are contaminating the most beautiful part of our country. This is God's country. This ain't even only our country, this is everyone's land. And you guys aren't even from here. You don't know. You don't know nothing about what you're doing to us as people. You don't know nothing. As soon as you come here with money and you think that you can take us over, money ain't no object to us, we don't need

your money. We live off this land, you're polluting our land. And I'm telling you right now, nobody is going to stand for what you're doing. You guys are fighting a battle of a lot. It's way more than you can handle. My best advice to you is to move and get off our land because we're not going to stand for this. That mapping isn't even accurate.

Inat mapping isn't even accurate. It don't even have our water on there. A lot of the water isn't even visible on there. You don't have our main -- the Mississippi comes straight from here. And you're going to put a pipeline all the way around it and through it and through every other lake that you can't even see. You don't know what you're doing.

And I say this from my heart. And I thank you for your time, but you really need to look around and see who you're affecting because of money.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you.

Richard Bogart. Somebody told me he came back, and then he left again.

Michael Swan. Michael Swan.

MR. MICHAEL SWAN: Can I use that?

(Speaking in Ojibwe).

O

My name is Michael Swan, S-W-A-N, one N. I am the director of natural resources for the White Earth Indian Reservation. I've been in this field for 30 years. And hopefully I'll be able to retire out of here. But I always see people like this coming back at me here so I got to get involved. There's a couple things I want to point out, and I'd like to thank Frank Bibeau and Peter Erlinder for some of the things that they said.

One of the things I want to first point out to you, though, is the position of the White Earth Reservation, that's who I work for. They have not come forward for or against this project. They want more information about it. They want to understand what the purposes of this is for. So they haven't made their decisions. And that's why I'm here, is to get information so I can take it back and advise them of what the proposals are.

On the part I see here on the maps that was out here in the front, there's concern of being close to areas of lakes that have wild rice. I'm going to say the same things, what has been said before. This is a right of the tribal people, native people, Ojibwe people here to hunt, fish, and

gather. You come into an area where there's lakes, watersheds, rivers coming from those areas.

And I notice one thing, too, that across Clearwater County or township, these four townships here, where we rice, Long Lost Lake Township. To us this is still considered the original boundaries of the reservation. And as far as I know, the Department of Natural Resources, there really has not been any type of consultation between this proposal and to the tribe. The tribe is a sovereign government. We are sovereign. We are not a special interest. This is something for us to consider because it's going to affect our future.

I think a lot of people already said something that I am not going to repeat all that they say, our water, our rice, our resources, our fish, our deer, all of this ties together. And I've also been asked by some tribal members, I noticed already they've been requesting other meetings. Well, then, White Earth, meet with our members and ask them how we feel about it. I think that'll come out pretty good and strong, listen to us. I just wanted you to know that.

There are things here that you guys are not specific. I wouldn't want any of your guys's

jobs at the Public Utilities Commission. You got to take the things, you got to hear, and I have dealt with it over the years myself. But still, you got to make decisions on what has to be taking place on what is right or what is wrong and that's not always easy.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Janet is getting kind of tired, so why don't we take a real short break. About five minutes, does that work? No, but she's saying yes. So why don't we take a five-minute break and come back. I've got about six or seven cards left, I would like to hear from everybody, but we're going to have to close down fairly soon for the next meeting this evening.

(Break taken from 2:11 to 2:24.)

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Attention, everyone. If you could please find a seat so we can reconvene. I know we have several speakers who wish to address us yet. We'll go until 3:00 and at that point we do need to cut things off because we have to get to our next destination for our next meeting. So if you could grab a seat we'll get started on the next speaker. Thank you.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card

I have is Dawn Goodwin. Dawn Goodwin.

My name

Today

1 MS. DAWN GOODWIN: That would be me. MR. LARRY HARTMAN: 2 I know I have -- I probably have about ten speaker cards left, and 3 4 since we only have a half an hour left, if everybody 5 could be as concise as possible, it would be 6 appreciated. Thank you. 7 MS. DAWN GOODWIN: No problem. is Dawn Goodwin, D-A-W-N, G-O-O-D-W-I-N. 8 9 I don't usually get up in front of a 10 crowd of people and speak unless I'm compelled to. 11 I like to sit in the back and let everybody speak. 12 This is my home and everybody else's home. Will you 13 be living anywhere along your proposed route? 14 of you? Close proximity, a landowner? 15 MR. JOHN PECHIN: It goes right through 16 my neighborhood. 17 MS. DAWN GOODWIN: Okay. I just had a 18 question. Today I come here to speak for myself, 19 yes, but for the people that can't be here. 20 I'm speaking for the grandmas that were going to 21 come with me and they couldn't. 22 Every summer I go with the grandmas and 23 we go pick berries. You're proposed light -- or 24 your proposed route, excuse me, goes so close to the 25 biggest berry patch in this country. When I go to

the berry patch I cross over two pipelines in the ground already. I fear that those will degrade and contaminate our area. So you want to put another pipeline in that's going to triple our fear. Oil has great kinetic energy.

And I want to make one point, is that I have family and I have friends from the point of extraction, wherever you're going. Family and friends that I care about, that live within proximity and further out. This could affect us. Affect our health. We are human beings. We do not have immortal life. All these oils hold contaminates. Highly volatile.

This company that you are representing, shall I say represent supporting, is getting oil from a very highly radioactive rock. Does everybody know that? I don't think everybody knows that. Shale is the most highly radioactive rock. And you are supporting this industry.

I do not support this industry. This industry has the highest potential to hurt the people of North Dakota. I have family that live there. I have nephews that hunt and fish that area. Soon they may be ingesting fish and deer and geese that are contaminated.

So I oppose this. I do not even see an alternative route. We have enough pipelines already. If I quote the president, he said we have enough pipelines to go around the world eight times. It needs to stop. It needs to stop. We need to move away from the tyranny of oil. You guys are just buying into it. Keep buying in, buying in. Come to this area and promise these jobs to people. And that's why so many turn their head, because they want that money.

But I'd like to challenge you guys. Come here in the summer, enjoy, get to know the people along this route. See what we're talking about. Even this map doesn't even show you what impact it could have. White Earth Reservation isn't even on here.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's a phony map.

 ${\tt UNIDENTIFIED:} \quad {\tt The Mississippi River.}$

MS. DAWN GOODWIN: Yes, the Mississippi River. There's no bog areas. The bogs are our biggest water filtration systems. You're going to be going through all this area.

Something really raised in my mind as I read this quote one day. And it said the further man gets away from the earth, the harder their

hearts become. So I want you to think about that. How close are you to the earth? Do you go out there every day and thank the Creator for giving you the earth? For giving you the wind and the air and the sky and the sun and the moon? And the ground below us where our food comes from, where our water comes from? Do you do that? Do you thank earth? Earth has become an object. It's not an object, it's life giving.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Janell Saunders.

MS. JANELL SAUNDERS: My name is Janell Saunders, that's J-A-N-E-L-L, Saunders, S-A-U-N-D-E-R-S.

My husband and I own property where the pipeline is going through. We own 60 acres on County Road 109 just west of 110. We have a stock pond that is approximately a couple hundred feet from where the pipeline is going in. When we had the stock pond put in, we went through the Soil Conservation Service. We had to do that, and they said this is where the stock pond was authorized --we were authorized to dig. It is where the stock pond had to go because of the water table and that's where the best soil was.

And, let's see. Excuse me, I'm nervous.

2

4

3

5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is the only water for the horses we have on our property. Moving the stock pond is really not an option. And when the work is being done on your pipeline, the horses will not go there because it'll be just too close to the work.

They'll be afraid and they won't go out there.

Also, when the pipeline -- when the work is done, will you have a surveyor out there to survey our property line again to make sure the fence line gets in the correct place? We have Potlatch on three sides of our property. I was wondering why you can't use the area where the existing pipelines are if you have to have the pipeline.

And I was told that a full environmental impact statement under the Environmental Policy Act has not been done and I'd like to know why that is and I would like to request that a full EIS be done, please.

I would also like to request a time extension. Some of my neighbors are not here at this time of year and they deserve time to study and review their options.

I have heard about your 2010 Kalamazoo spill and I'd like to know what did you do to clean

1 up that spill and what is the impact on them. already know what the impact of a spill would do to 2 us, my husband and I. I also know over the past ten 3 4 years you've had over 800 oil spills. That would 5 devastate our lakes and forests around here. would destroy the livelihood of hundreds of people. 6 7 Thank you. MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I'm not sure on the 8 first name, G-W-E, Gasco, G-A-S-C-O. 9 10 MR. GWE GASCO: Um, I'm just going to 11 talk about all my friends here at the Park Rapids 12 school that don't know what's going to happen to 13 their own land and their families. And I just 14 wanted to give kind of a perspective from my 15 generation. And, you know, maybe you guys don't 16 think about the future for me or my friends, but I 17 And this pipeline doesn't really look like it's 18 going to help me at all. That's pretty much it. 19 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you. William Sayers, S-A-Y-E-R-S, III. Is Mr. Sayers here? 20 21 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, he's coming up. We 22 don't want him to miss school for nothing. 23 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: William Sayers. 24 MR. WILLIAM SAYERS, III: So my name is William Sayers, S-A-Y-E-R-S. 25

1 I believe that this pipeline wouldn't help us. It is affecting our land, our people, the 2 generations. My generation, think of the things 3 4 that it would do to our children, my grandchildren, 5 my great-grandchildren. These things that happen in 6 the future are going to affect us now. I believe I'm speaking for my elders, the 7 people around me, the people I don't know. 8 9 Everybody around this region, it's affecting all of 10 The plants, our environment, you know, our 11 atmosphere, everything. In my eyes, the people 12 around me and my friends, they don't know these 13 They're not connected to what me and my 14 brother are. But that's it. 15 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: David Schornack, 16 S-C-H-O-R-N-A-C-K. Is David Schornack here? 17 S-C-H-O-R-N-A-C-K? 18 Mick Ryan. Mick Ryan? 19 Winona LaDuke. 20 MS. WINONA LADUKE: (Speaking in Ojibwe.) 21 I know that you don't understand that, 22 but there's a lot of people who do. I'm from this 23 land, we've lived here about 8,000, 9,000 years. 24 That's a lot longer than a 65-year-old corporation.

We have some experience. We know our

25

__

device, we know where our medicinal sites are, we know where our sacred sites are, we know that this water is our livelihood. Nothing of that is either on that map or in your process. We are deeply concerned about that.

We are very pleased to see that some of our people came from the White Earth Reservation, this is a hardship for us. You need to have a meeting in Rice Lake on the White Earth Reservation, the community you're proposing to most impact, and the mother lode of our wild rice crop on our reservation. If you choose to try to impact us, you need to see our faces. You need to come and be accountable to our community. That is how things are done appropriately.

This whole area is our area. You need to understand that. This is entirely our treaty rights area. And we've already said that we expressed great concern because in no way is this process, in its short term of deliberation, going to have any way to assess any potential impact.

All the people here feel very similar. I did hear one exception, the guy that drives the bus. I hope he has a good life driving the bus.

The rest of us know that this profits the

I'm a little bit concerned about the

people at the beginning and the people at the end. The rest of us bear the risk. We know that you have spills. One spill is too much for us. That is what everybody in this room has already told you. We know that you have really fancy equipment. We know that you have a thing called a pig, a pipeline inspection gauge. We know also know that it took you 17 hours to respond to the spill in Kalamazoo. And that that spill was not found by you, but that spill was found by someone who lived in the community. So we are the first responders. And we don't even have a right to respond here. That is a little bit of a problem for all of us here.

I have to say honestly that I want to believe in the system. I've tried everything in this system. And we are involved in the PUC process as intervenors. I'm the executive director of Honor the Earth. But more importantly, I'm an Ojibwe. I am from here. This is where my ancestors lived and those two are my children. They have a right to rice, they have a right to harvest medicines, they have the right to live a life which is unencumbered by your pollution for your profits. All of us do. We have that same right.

process. First, it is too short. Second, your hearings and your open meetings, people could not get here that worked. People could not get here who didn't know about it because they didn't happen to see the announcement. We are broadcasting this live on the radio station on the reservation because people are concerned. Most people don't even have gas to get down here. So your process does not allow for full participation by the people who are in fact most impacted. That is a very big concern to all of us.

In addition, I will point out that I don't know if your system is biased or not. I want to believe the system, as I said, but I've got a few problems.

For instance, a question was asked by my colleague, we are discussing a route in which you have, from our understanding, already begun purchasing easements. That seems, as some of the others said, a little bit of the cart before the horse. I actually drive a team and I wouldn't want to run my life like that. Do not make us deliberate a route that you have neither announced, but at the same time you are in the process of going behind all of our backs to pick people off one by one because

of the poverty of this area. That's not right.

I'm deeply concerned about the PUC process as well. The studies indicate that in fact pipelines are far more risky than anything that goes on a railroad. That is the reality. So if it is your opinion, sir, and you are reviewing the process, we find it deeply of concern to us, that you actually believe that that is true. 'Cause the fact is is that I can watch a rail line.

Over the past decades, pipelines have spilled 474,000 barrels of oil compared to 216,000 barrels spilled over the same time by railroads. Pipelines are not safer. Unfortunately, Bakken just blows up, because it's the stuff that should not be in the pipeline, it should not be taken out of the ground at all. You are asking us to bear the risk of all that. That is not fair to the members of this community.

We are intervening in this to be a part of this as much as we can. We would ask the public officials in the State of Minnesota to be representing us. We actually want a fair process. And we would like a full and inclusive process, including, as the previous person asked for, an environmental impact statement, because they are

required under federal law because it affects our treaty rights. This is something that should not be made in some back-door deals in a short process.

The future of our land and water is far too important.

Thank you for your time.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: We have about 15 minutes left. I'm going to call the people I called on before who weren't here then, and then if they aren't here, the stack of cards I have left is people who have spoken in previous meetings. So I'd like to call Richard Bogart again, if he's here?

David Schornack? Not here. Mick Ryan.

And I have five cards left. Mary, you spoke for someone else before, did you want to speak for yourself?

MS. MARY ADAMS: Really fast.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Please.

MS. MARY ADAMS: I was on my way here this morning and I thought, well, what are you going to say, I'm not going to say anything, I don't want to speak. But I'm here and I have to say something.

To me, in a nutshell, it's about values and it's about the future. Now, we have all heard, you have heard volumes of people that have spoken

here today. The values of the love for the wetlands, the love for the rice beds, the rivers, the wildlife. This is beautiful. It's exquisite. The values -- we value the people who come in here in the summer and spend their money and we want to keep them coming.

I'll be quick.

What about the future? I think when my time comes to exit this world I want it to be said I've done something good, I've done something not only for the children, but the family I love, the friends that I care for and love, the people I have met. But I want it to be said that I have done something better for this land or this wildlife or this environment, because this is what counts, what this earth is like when I leave it, not what this earth is like now. What is it going to be in 50 years?

My time is up. Thanks for letting me speak.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Thank you.

I have four cards left and they've all spoken at previous meetings. So why don't I just maybe call all of you up, you can sit or stand at the table. And maybe you guys want to allocate the

and Doug. So why don't you guys decide how you want to share your time.

time amongst yourselves. Marty, Willis, Michael,

MR. MARTY COBENAIS: Well, my name is Marty Cobenais. I represent the indigenous people of Bemidji, Minnesota.

I have been doing the -- working for the last eight years doing pipeline work all across American. Not only Alberta Clipper, but also Keystone XL and TransCanada out in Montana. So I know a few things about pipelines.

One of the first things I really wanted to say is that, you know, the PUC decision back for the Alberta Clipper was actually denied the first time due to wild rice beds in Fond du Lac. 'Cause the route was supposed to go to the south of the reservation. And the flow of the water goes to the north to the St. Louis River, so it was going to affect the wild rice beds if there was ever a leak. And lo and behold, the Sandpiper is supposed to go the same route. So I urge this, the PUC and the Department of Commerce, to not allow this route for that reason.

But there's also other circumstances with that. Last week I talked about that Enbridge talked

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about their hydrogen sulfide levels, what they consider safe, and in Reuters, oil shippers back down from Bakken sulfide gas dispute, Enbridge. May 8th, Enbridge said that they wanted five parts per million for sulfide gas to be in their pipelines, saying that was safe for their employees. And in the state of Minnesota, I'm going to add, for sulfide levels in the Polymet mine is 10 percent or 10 parts per million. On May 17th, a week later, Enbridge said that they would accept crude oil with higher levels of potentially deadly sulfide gas with advance notice. Those sulfide levels that they found in some of the tanks in North Dakota were at 1200 parts per million. Safe for human people is up Between 100 to 200 parts per million can to 200. result in immediate death.

So, with that, the wild rice that we have, in the sulfide mining industry says that they can only go up to 10 percent. So why can pipelines be able to go 20 times that amount and allow up to 200 parts per million? Something that I don't know if you guys have really thought about, but that was actually through your guys 'loading dock in North Dakota that loads up the trains. If you guys didn't know that, Enbridge loads trains over in North

1 Dakota too.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So part of what we have to really look at, then, is when they sit and talk about the Bakken oil fields, Bakken produces about a million barrels per day. 61 percent of that goes by rail already, loaded by Enbridge. So they're asking to put in a brand new pipeline that's going to take out another 225,000, there you have another pipeline that carries it, the North Dakota pipeline comes over to Clearbrook already, and they also have another pipeline that goes up to Canada that connects up to the mainland. So why do we really need this pipeline? That's actually over the one million barrels per day that they're going to produce. there's really no need. I know that that's not the issue here today, is the need, but it had to be said.

UNIDENTIFIED: They don't need it.

MR. MARTY COBENAIS: Let's see here. One of the other issues that I really quickly want to say is that some people have talked about pipeline techniques and safe techniques and everything else like that. Pipelines, yes, they do have a smart pig, it has its own faults even by the maker that created it. John, from Michigan, has already said

that the smart pig has technical difficulties and is not necessarily 100 percent. And, yes, they have to run it through the pipelines once every two years by federal standards. And Enbridge says that they do it once every year for all their pipelines.

The question, or not really a question, but part of that is that if they do find something wrong in the pipeline, like a rust spot or something like that, there's no guidelines that tell them how fast they have to go to fix that. Which is what happened in Deer River a couple years ago. They did the smart pig, nine months later they found a half-inch crack, not discovered by the technology of pipeline monitoring, but by forest fire fires, because there was a forest fire and that went up in flames.

So we obviously have seen the technology to say leak detection systems work, is what they say. In reality, leak detections don't work with small leaks. Deer River was a half-inch crack in that pipeline.

So the other thing, and I'm going to get off here real quick, but Park Rapids people, right now they're coming through you with Sandpiper.

Another six months or so they're going to be coming

back here for line 3. They've already announced, the company yesterday, that they're coming south in the ground and coming south. So you landowners are going to have to deal with another easement. White Earth, you're going to have to deal with another pipeline which is going to be carrying tar sands oil.

What they want to do, what they're trying to say with this is that they don't need to go through a presidential permit also because it's a replacement line, where in reality and integral to it is it's increasing pressure and an entirely new route. So this is just a fair warning for all of you in this community. They are coming back.

I did talk to Mr. Bachman (phonetic) around here earlier and, yes, they are purchasing land. They're threatening landowners already. Telling them they have 60 days to sign an easement or they will get substantially less money. So those things are already happening. They will come back and threaten eminent domain and those type of things. And in fighting the pipelines, the Republicans, we think about the Tea Party as extreme right Republicans. They want the XL pipeline because of eminent domain rights.

So this is -- this is amazing that they come here and ask you guys for all this information when they already have the route picked out.

They're not going to go through -- they expect you guys to say, okay, we're going to take your money. And reality is, you guys can still say no. Land owners, you can still say no. You can tell them you're not allowed on our land to survey the land. Landowners, get a group together. Stand together. Be friends with each other. Stand up and say no.

Thank you.

MR. WILLIS MATTISON: I'll try and be brief. My name is Willis Mattison, M-A-T-T-I-S-O-N.

I would like the comments that I wanted to make on technical issues and to the point of the meeting in terms of environmental review and aspects that I wanted to include, but time has precluded that and I will submit those in writing.

But I think that the record needs to show that, once again, the Department of Commerce has expressly said that you would not play an advocacy role. That's extremely disappointing because the public, the people of Minnesota, expect the Public Utilities Commission to advocate for full disclosure of information. Instead, you have used your

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

25

UNIDENTIFIED: Hear, hear.

MR. WILLIS MATTISON: Mr. Hartman, if

authority and role here to block a group of citizens, Friends of the Headwaters, who have stepped up and were going to be the advocates for the citizens to know more information than just that which Enbridge would have the community know.

Their maps, as it's been pointed out, are woefully inadequate in their representation of the resources at stake. Our group wanted to put together alternate maps that did show many of these resources in graphic form. It's very difficult for me or the previous people who testified, especially Bob Merritt had especially good photographs, I'll hold one up here, which would graphically demonstrate some of the numbers and spatial relationships of wells to the pipeline. We wanted to put this on a poster and put it on the board inside the room for other people to see, yet your staff prohibited our ability to do that. ashamed of my state government. You should be standing here supporting the citizens' right to congregate and to show the misleading, inaccurate, and incomplete information that this pipeline is putting before us.

you're going to bend over backward one way or the other, please bend over backward in favor of more information, not less. When we want to put displays in the room that will increase people's ability to fully understand, ask more questions, support broader environmental impact statements, that's important. We want you to allow them to see why many people are requesting that, in order to understand the full scope of what you're asking to be allowed this company over here, represented by a virtual platoon of experts. Our organization tried to pull together a ragtag group of engineers, of surveyors, hydrologists, and this kind of thing, and bring forth a little bit of information.

Your attorney confronted me at the meeting in Crookston and told me not to display what I had there. After that, you apparently twisted tails and put pressure, political pressure on this organization here, they yielded to you. What is it that you think we have in terms of new information that you're so afraid of? How small are you that you stand in our way to contradict or to complete the kind of information that these people need to know in order to understand what you're asking them to trade?

We know, because of the Bristol Bay environmental impact statement, one that was done completely, I will leave a copy of the probability of leak assessment that was done on the pipelines supplying that line in Alaska. They've concluded it was a virtual certainty over the life of the pipeline that there would be a major release. You put up a 99.9993 percent safety record, which is misleading. It's accurate and you have a right to say it, but we also have a right to say when you look on the other side of that coin it actually quarantees a release.

Are you afraid of us telling the public that, that you would lobby and actually win over this department and prohibit us from putting that kind of material in front? Why don't you stand up and tell them it's okay? Tell them it's okay for us to set up our display and that we will stand and debate you toe-to-toe. We will stand against your attorney. We will stand against your engineer. We will stand against your environmental officer. And we'll offer our numbers and you tell us our numbers are wrong. If we are, we will admit it. But don't be so afraid of us that you won't let us put our numbers in front of you.

MR. MICHAEL DAHL: Well, Larry?

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: We have two left,

Michael and Doug.

MR. MICHAEL DAHL: Hi, my name is Michael

Dahl. (Speaking in Ojibwe.)

I will speak English again. You know who

I am by now. And like I said last week, by the end

of this, just like I can recite your little proposal

and your presentation, you will be able to introduce

me in Ojibwe by the time we get done with all of

this.

. .

What I said differently this time is because I actually had written down, as per Larry's request, an official comment. And oddly enough, it was based on my opposition to this routing process. Based on a number of questions that I asked during the Crookston, McIntosh, and Clearbrook meetings, I've asked a number of questions, none of which were answered. None of which were answered directly. Which yet again here today, from the people of Park Rapids and my own reserve, who got up here and sat down here and they asked the questions that I had, even after I read the things that you asked me to read. I read that 150-page document. I read all of these things.

2

4 5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

But the fact of the matter is, is that my -- my actual written comments has been covered by my relatives here today. And the thing that I want to add to that is that our opposition to this, yes, there are current pipelines; yes, I drove a vehicle here; yes, I have a cell phone; yes, I have plastic and rubber items in my home, all petroleum based.

But you know what is in my house that is not petroleum based? Me, my children, my grandchildren. Yes, I have grandchildren. Who else isn't petroleum based? You. You are not petroleum based. And, quite frankly, as hard as I tried, I tried so hard with you guys not to be personal. I tried so hard, but I can't do it. It is not in my being to not be personal when you are threatening the very thing that has kept our people alive for thousands of years. We were told to come this way. To the rice. To the manoomin. That's where we were told to come. Well over 100,000 pounds of finished wild rice. That's documented wild rice. That's not counting what these two men, father and son, together rice. That's not documented. Well over 1,000 pounds just between them. The rice that my family rices, that's just off of one lake.

I'm asking again, when an EIS is done,

22

23

24

25

1

because more than enough people have asked for an environmental impact statement. I want to see, we want to see how much rice are you going to go near? And when I say near, I don't mean five, ten miles. I mean within miles. I mean within that, all of that, where are you going to go by, how much rice, the state grain of Minnesota? How many red pine trees, Norway pine trees are you going to go by, the state tree of Minnesota? One of our medicines. many lady's slippers are you going to go by, the state flower of Minnesota? One of our greatest medicines for depression. And 95 percent of our depression is caused by (Ojibwe), the original immigrants. And here you come again. And how dare you. How dare you roll your eyes at my nephew, how dare you giggle at my nephew who comes up here and question his credibility because his pants hang a little bit. Like my pants. We don't have a butt, that's why our pants sag. I'm offended, I am appalled, and you have made it a personal thing now because you are threatening my people and our friends.

The difference between the years of the Sandpiper -- of the Alberta Clipper and all the other lines that have been run through here and now

is two things. One, we didn't know then what we know now. Because we took responsibility of finding the risk that you refused to tell us. You didn't tell us the risk. I asked what is .0007 percent nonsafe. I still have yet to see that answered when you promised, Mark, I will get that answer for you. You said I will do it.

The other thing that's different between then and now is you guys are witnessing history. You are witnessing history. Never in my lifetime or any of my grandparents' lifetimes have Anishinabe and Zhaagnaash stood together. Never have they sat together. We have had enough.

Because, yes, I bought my petroleum based gas off of money I had to borrow to get over here and to follow you to Pine River and to follow you to McGregor where more of my relatives will be. We're the nice ones. Prepare yourself.

I've had enough. Because the fact is that the gas was 3.59 to get to Park Rapids, I had to get gas in Pine Point on my reserve where it's another 10 cents more expensive. So what is the benefit that we get? You have all these lists of benefits, but what do I get? What do these people get? We get a money settlement that's all going to

3

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be gone long before even you're gone. Long before. And what is that going to leave for anybody?

I've sat and watched you guys for months now, for months now, and I even do express, and I really mean it, it's nice to see you, because that's why I don't have an alternative route. I will not propose an alternative route. Because although I do not like your tactics, I still have concern for you. I still have concern for your safety, for your grandchildren.

Our wild rice is our life. I've told you before, it's not just a holiday dinner. It's not just a casserole that we have when we have special company. That's our life. And I want to ensure that seven generations from now, that my great, great-great-grandchildren will be able to provide that casserole for your great-great-grandchildren.

I am in opposition to this. I am asking, I am asking, I want to see that number, you promised I will get that number for you, Michael. You even referred to me by name. I will get it for you. That was months ago. I want those numbers.

I will not provide an alternative route. I won't. There isn't one. There isn't an acceptable one. Find another way. Find another

O

way. You guys can make \$48 billion a year, billions of dollars a year you make. You can't spend a little bit of money and try and invest in finding alternative routes and be the first company that really invests in the future of this country?

We can make solar panels. We can make cars that aren't reliant on gas. We can do that. Change your mind. Quit trying to change ours. And maybe, just maybe back there, the guy in the cowboy hat -- it's good to see you too. You've got nice boots, by the way. He's the bigwig from Superior, one of the bigwigs, okay. And you people here, thank you to all of you's.

I'm only 38, I'm in the 39th month, this is the month of my birthday. And what a blessing I was born and raised in this area. It was not safe for me to walk around sometimes in this area as an Indian boy. Never in my life did I ever think that I would see nonnative people stand up and back us up. Thank you. Thank you.

That's all I have to say at this time.

I'll try not to take up any more time. But, you know, McGregor, my relatives will be there. That's East Lake, that's the second best rice in this world, East Lake. Be prepared. Be prepared.

MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Doug, did you want to say anything? Okay, thank you. With that the meeting will conclude. We'll be here for a little while longer if you have any questions of me, Enbridge will be here also. I'd like to thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to attend. We do appreciate it. The oral reports will be posted on our website and eDockets also, so please take the time to review them if you so choose to. Again, thank you for attending. (Meeting concluded at 3:14 p.m.)